

1-1-2004

The professionalization of the apparel design program at Iowa State University

Ellen Marie Frisius
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

Recommended Citation

Frisius, Ellen Marie, "The professionalization of the apparel design program at Iowa State University" (2004). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 20418.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/20418>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

**The professionalization of the apparel design program at
Iowa State University**

by

Ellen Marie Frisius

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Textiles and Clothing

Program of Study Committee:
Jean L. Parsons, Major Professor
Jane Farrell-Beck
Mary Huba

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2004

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the master's thesis
Ellen Marie Frisius
has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. WOMEN, WORK, AND EDUCATION	5
Early Seminary and College Education	7
The Link between Education and Employment	10
Teaching as an Occupation	11
Women and Employment	13
Brief History of the Apparel Industry and Women's Education for Design	25
Vocational Education	26
Career Advice for Prospective Fashion Designers	32
Brief History of Home Economics	36
Image of Home Economics	47
Gender Issues within Home Economics	50
CHAPTER 3. TEXTILES AND CLOTHING AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY	55
Brief History of Textiles and Clothing at ISU	55
Seeds of Change: 1930-1950	59
Transitions to Professionalization: 1950 to the mid-1980s	63
Textiles and Clothing at Other Colleges and Universities	73
Evolution of Professionalization of Apparel Design at ISU	80
Coursework	81
Internships and Study Tours	100
CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY	106

APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS PERMISSION FORM	110
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	112
REFERENCES CITED	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Marital Status of Women in the Civilian Labor Force 1940-1980	6
Table 2. Women's Participation in the Labor Force	18
Table 3. Employment of Women by Major Occupational Group, 1940-1980	20
Table 4. The Changing Concept of the Purpose of Home Economics	49

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of the Apparel Design Program at Iowa State University over the transitional period from 1940-1980 was closely tied to changing perceptions of women's roles in the sphere of higher education and in the workplace. The history of women in the workforce and in higher education encompassed a wide variety of topics and issues.

Historically, women worked in jobs that revolved around traditional feminine activities, such as domestic labor and needle trades. Wage-earning women struggled with many issues, including equality in the workplace and a need to overcome characterizations and stereotypes that a woman's primary role was to take care of the home and family.

Women not only faced challenges in the labor force, but also in the area of higher education. Colleges opened their doors to women in the mid to late 1800s, but relatively few women pursued a college degree at that time due to cost and to familial obligations. While formal domestic arts and sciences courses existed as early as the first part of the nineteenth century, the field of home economics developed at the end of the nineteenth century with the purpose to give women an education that they could use in their everyday life as homemakers and to open the door to professional possibilities. As perceptions of women gradually changed and the idea of women having a career outside the home became more widely accepted, home economics educators attempted to modify the focus of their programs to reflect these changes.

Home economics educators struggled to balance courses that prepared women to be homemakers with courses that prepared women for professional careers. This dualistic purpose in home economics existed in numerous programs, including the apparel design program at Iowa State University. In the same way that home economists changed their

focus to match changing perceptions of women, individual programs were reshaped and redefined to meet the changing needs of both students and industry. This research attempts to show how this dualistic role affected women and wage-work, and specifically the evolution of professionalism in apparel design programs within home economics colleges. For this thesis, research focused on Iowa State University as a case study in the transformation toward professionalization within the textiles and clothing field and particularly the apparel design major from 1940-1980.¹ Although change continued to occur after 1980, much of the groundwork was laid in this period.

The study explored Iowa State's textiles and clothing program using primary and secondary sources including course catalogs, unpublished meeting notes and newsletters, and opinions of former and present Iowa State University textiles and clothing faculty members. The research focused on the evolution of professionalization in the Textiles and Clothing Department, the apparel design program, and the beginnings of home economics and early domestic education at Iowa State College. Understanding the development of the Home Economics Division at Iowa State is an important key to changes made in the Apparel Design program within the Textiles and Clothing Department, which developed within home economics.² The study of this department also provides a case study perspective on the

¹ In this paper, the term professionalization is defined as the process of acquiring the specialized study and training required by a "body of qualified persons in an occupation or field" (Evenson & Patwell, 1994, p. 660). Professionalization is "the act or process of making or becoming a professional...and to give professional character to: to treat as or convert into a profession" (Gove, 1981, p. 1811).

² At Iowa State, Home Economics became an independent division in 1913. It was designated a college in 1958, when Iowa State College became a university. Textiles and clothing was a part of the Domestic Art Department in Home Economics until 1919 when Domestic Art became the Household Art Department. Textiles and Clothing became its own department in 1924. Apparel design was a part of the Applied Art Department until the mid-1930s when it transferred into the Textiles and Clothing Department.

development of women's education for the period 1940-1980. Women comprised the majority of students in the Textiles and Clothing Department and in home economics; therefore, perspectives on women's education in a general sense, and also specifically at Iowa State, are key elements in this study.

The time period for this research project is fairly recent and many of the faculty members who taught in the textiles and clothing program are still active members of the community. I conducted oral history interviews with former faculty members who taught in the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State University between 1940 and 1980.³ Oral history includes collecting "spoken memories and personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews" (Ritchie, 1995, p. 1). The interviews focused on the courses professors taught, how they incorporated industry training into their courses, and how the image of home economics affected course content.⁴ The interviews provided valuable insight from the educators' viewpoint and provided additional support to primary and secondary sources.

Given the nature of this study, there are several limitations. The research focuses on the years between 1940 and 1980, as these years best reflect the period when changes toward professionalization in the apparel design program at Iowa State University evolved. It was

³ Approval for conducting oral history interviews from the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research was obtained on October 16, 2000 (Appendix A).

⁴ Participants were purposively selected using the textiles and clothing department archives as well as recommendations from present faculty at Iowa State University. An introductory letter outlining the procedure for interview and asking permission for an interview was sent on October 17, 2000. Included in the letter was a postcard asking for preferences in times and dates for an interview and a copy of the interview questions (Appendix B). The four interviews took place between November 8 and December 6, 2000. Three interviews were taped on a cassette recorder and one was a handwritten record. All four of these interviews were transcribed on a word processor and then returned to the participants to ensure accuracy and reliability. The corrected interviews were then analyzed through text and content methods.

also a time when the apparel industry not only recognized but also sought out American designers. This study is further limited in scope by the available materials that document how decisions were made.

CHAPTER 2. WOMEN, WORK, AND EDUCATION

The issues surrounding women's wage-work are many, but there was one major recurring theme, women were drawn in two conflicting directions: the workforce and the home. Changing perceptions of women's roles at home and in the workforce influenced wage-work and education and caused significant changes in both. A brief overview of the history of women in wage-work and in education provides important context for this study. The changes in the societal views of these two areas had a direct impact on the development of home economics in general, and specifically at Iowa State University. This chapter will trace the important changes that took place for women during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Understanding the opportunities and limitations presented to women in the workplace provides a broader perspective on women's career choices. This is significant when it is joined with research on education for women, the reasons why home economics, and specifically textiles and clothing, slowly added an emphasis on career preparation for the apparel industry, and an understanding of the links between education and career. Many women came to view higher education as a way to combat the stereotypes and prejudices that kept them from gaining a major foothold in the workforce. However, because women had their own "sphere," which encompassed taking care of the home and family, working outside of the home was often left for the husband (Scott, 1971). The percentage of single women who worked in the labor force was higher than for married women until the 1950s when the percentage of married women in the workforce increased significantly (See Table 1). Many single women chose to work after college until they marriage or until the first child arrived (Kievett, 1968; LeBaron, 1957; Moen, 1992). Since most women eventually chose

Table 1: Marital Status of Women in the Civilian Labor Force 1940-1980^a

Year	Marital Status	Total Number of Women in the Labor Force	Percent Distribution of Female Labor Force ^b	Female Labor Force as Percent of Total Female Population
1940 ^c				
	Single	6,710,000	48.5	48.1
	Married	5,040,000	36.4	16.7
1950 ^d				
	Single	5,621,000	31.6	50.5
	Married	9,273,000	52.1	24.8
1960 ^e				
	Single	5,401,000	24.0	44.1
	Married	13,485,000	59.9	31.7
1970				
	Single	6,965,000	22.3	53.0
	Married	19,799,000	63.4	41.4
1980 ^f				
	Single	10,911,000	24.8	61.2
	Married	26,347,000	59.9	50.7

^a Source: United States Department of Commerce. (1981). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (102 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. pp. 388-389.

^b The percentages do not equal 100 because it does not include widowed or divorced women in the workforce.

^c Labor force for 1940 includes those 14 years of age and older.

^d Labor force for 1950 includes those 14 years of age and older.

^e Labor force for 1960 includes those 14 years of age and older.

^f Labor force for the years 1965 to 1980 includes those 16 years of age and older.

the home and family as a “career” at some stage in their life, training that benefited them in this role often became the focus of women’s education.

Women faced struggles in the area of work outside the home. Some people held the viewpoint that women were necessary to a stable home life, while manufacturers viewed women as an essential part of the labor force. These conflicting views impacted not only job opportunities, but also opportunities for higher education. In The Girl Question in Education, Powers summed up the challenges that women faced when seeking a career:

The inherent contradiction between the market needs and the myth of true womanhood was not reconciled; it was generally ignored. But, the myth of true womanhood stood in the wings of the industrial workplace to be paraded out when it was socially or economically expedient, thus marginalizing women's work. (1992, p. 10)

This statement provides a strong sense of the ambivalent position women faced when they worked outside the home or pursued an education in the period prior to this study. Although some women found working outside the home difficult, many others chose to work in paid positions outside the home.

Early Seminary and College Education

Women's formal educational opportunities evolved slowly. Historically, before the 19th century, a woman's primary task in life was the care of the home and the family. Many people felt that women belonged in the home and that it was their sole responsibility and role in life. Women also had very few legal rights which, when coupled with familial responsibilities, meant limited access to formal education.

The importance of a higher education for women was generally not recognized prior to the late nineteenth century. Formal education was not viewed as important because it was assumed that the home provided a good training center for all the educational needs for young girls before they entered into marriage. Family, family influences, and economic reasons were also major causes of women's low school attendance (Boas, 1935).

Although women's education was not widespread during the nineteenth century, there were a few people who worked hard to promote schooling. Catharine Beecher was one of

these people.⁵ She did much to change the way that society felt about women and their need for education. She formed the Women's Education Association in 1852 to promote women's higher education and she collected money to be used as an endowment for founding women's educational institutions (Sklar, 1976; Woody, 1929).

Even though many did not see the need for women's education, female academies and seminaries appeared during the first half of the nineteenth century. These offered an education, but many women could not enter because of the expense. At Troy Female Seminary in Troy, New York, courses in fine arts and housewifery, in conjunction with literature, history, and mathematics, were part of the proposed program of study (Brown, 1985, vol.1). Undereducated women staffed some of these academies; therefore, they did not always provide a solid base of knowledge. Women like Catharine Beecher, Mary Lyon, and Mary Welch set out to change these conditions to make education for women an attainable goal and a valuable asset (Goodsell, 1931).

The idea of women attending college spread as high schools gave more substantial preparation and coursework to their students and as women's colleges and seminaries offered more financial aid. At Mary Sharp College, established in 1848 in Tennessee, the curricula provided women the "privilege of a classical education" and coursework that would be "as thorough as their brothers have been acquiring at their colleges and universities" (Woody,

⁵ Catharine Beecher worked to expand women's roles in society (Mintz, 1995), to lift society's image of women, and to provide a field of study that would interest them. She linked women's suffering to a lack of proper education.

[T]he deplorable suffering of multitude of young wives and mothers, from the combined influence of poor health, poor domestics, and a defective domestic education...this evil results mainly from the fact, that young girls, especially in the more wealthy classes, are not trained for their profession. (Beecher, 1848, p. 5)

She wanted to place domestic economy education on the same level as other branches of study in science taught in female schools.

1929, p.142). Finding a field of study for women to enter that would be of interest to them and provide them with the knowledge and skills needed in their world was the reason for the creation of “Domestic Economy,” an early name for home economics. As Beecher (1848) stated in A Treatise on Domestic Economy, domestic economy “can never be studied properly until it is made a branch of study” (p. 6). The teaching of domestic economy provided a base of knowledge that was considered useful to both the student and her family.

Opinions on the purpose of women’s education differed. According to Woody (1929), the purposes of women’s education in the United States were as follows:

- (1) Preparation for home duties; (2) cultivation of formal gentility and grace for their social value...(3) discipline of the “mental powers” so that women might be ready for any emergency in life; and (4) more specific preparation for a variety of professional opportunities. Concurrent with all, except the last, there has been (5) a constant emphasis on religious and Christian purpose. (p. 192)

Most people in the mid-1850s agreed that the purpose of a formal education was to discipline the mind. According to late nineteenth century thinking, the one who most needed a well-disciplined mind was a mother. As a teacher of her children, she guided them morally, imparted wisdom, and shaped them intellectually. Even if women did not use their education for gainful employment, it was still considered important in raising a family and creating a better world through their children’s accomplishments (Boas, 1935).

Some believed that, after graduation, a woman had to make a choice between marriage and a career. A career for educated women in the late nineteenth century usually involved teaching. In 1879, educators at colleges like Vassar, Wellesley, and Smith believed women’s education was for life and for being a wife and mother (Boas, 1935). Despite criticism of women entering and graduating from college, they proved themselves as intellectually talented as their male counterparts. They obtained high grades and degrees in

the same curricula as men. These achievements led to an increasing number of colleges that admitted women, and the development of new colleges which placed an emphasis on providing a “women’s collegiate education based on utility rather than tradition” (Woody, 1929, p. 150).

As a counterpoint, under M. Carey Thomas’ leadership, Bryn Mawr College attempted to offer the best intellectual education for women. Students took courses in classical languages, sciences, and philosophy, but never any course that prepared them for marriage rather than for an independent career in academia. As a result, 62 percent of the graduates went on to pursue a graduate education between 1899 and 1908. Also, “only 10 percent of these women never worked in a position for which they were paid, ...while most went into occupations that were feminine-dominated or rapidly becoming so, such as elementary school teaching, clerical work or social work, a few became doctors and lawyers and 11 percent ... pursued a career in college teaching” (Wein, 1993, p. 340).

The link between education and employment

It was not until the last half of the nineteenth century that education began to be linked to career preparation, although that path was not clearly defined. Prior to the twentieth century, men and women learned job skills at the work site, often through apprenticeships, rather than in school (Clifford, 1982). The amount and type of formal education and training often marked a woman’s position of employment (Clifford, 1982; Parsons, 1998). According to Clifford, “the girl who left school for work after the eighth grade typically entered different work than the girl with high school experience” (p. 242).

It was not until the twentieth century that a college education was “a necessary

prerequisite for entrance into many men's jobs" (Matthaei, 1982, p. 287). Matthaei (1982) believed that "it was unavoidable that some college trained women would, once their minds were developed, choose to pursue courses of study that were not traditionally feminine, particularly once they had begun to believe in their own abilities" (p. 287). By the 1950s and 1960s, the link between education and the type of work was more defined. Women who entered the work force during this time were often well educated and young; taking advantage of various incentives toward acquiring a higher education and professional credentials (Kessler-Harris, 1982). The booming electronics industry and the expanding craft, professional, and managerial sectors provided many opportunities for women with a college education, although not all women could hold these higher paying jobs because a lack of education kept them in the lower wage bracket (Blackwelder, 1997).

By the end of the 1970s, there was a clear link between education and career, and many women viewed higher education as a way to prepare for a well paying job. About 75 percent of high school girls planned to attend college, but their reasons for attending differed greatly from previous decades. "Less than 10 percent admit they look forward to college in order to meet a husband; and only one percent say they'll be going simply because their parents want them to" (Blackwelder, 1997, p. 189).

Teaching as an occupation

One of the goals of early seminaries and colleges was to train teachers. Teaching was considered a "feminine" vocation because of the link between vocational homemaking and domesticity. "The formal teaching of the young in schools was [looked upon as] professional mothering... [and] as a kind of mothering, the teaching profession would prepare women for

their future mothering in their own families” (Matthaei, 1982, p. 179-80).

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, with the influx of women into colleges and the majority training to be teachers, many colleges and universities established education departments. These new education departments were intended to train elementary school teachers, while the education of high school teachers was left to other departments within the college. Not only were new departments developed during this time, but many normal schools were upgraded into teacher’s colleges to meet the rising number of students who sought training to be teachers (Clifford, 1982).

Teaching was also one of the leading occupations for women in all the years from 1870 through 1973. A 1918 census of 12,000 women graduates from nine colleges in the Eastern United States showed that 83.5 percent of those employed were teachers (Clifford, 1982). In 1973, 43 percent of all women in the “professional and technical occupations” (Clifford, 1982, p. 256) were teachers. Nursing, secretarial work, and library work were other occupations of choice (Clifford, 1982).

From 1850 through the 1920s, women made great progress in both formal education and in the workplace. However, the dual nature of education continued, with an emphasis on curricula that trained women for two “careers.” The dominant trend remained that women should stay at home with the family after marriage. Yet times were changing and the seed of educating women for professional jobs had been planted. The number of opportunities for women in the workforce rose through the 1920s, but even greater progress took place in women’s formal education and wage-work beginning in the 1930s.

Women and Employment

The 1930s were hard times economically as industrial production decreased, the number of jobs available decreased, and unemployment hit an all time high. The fear of unemployment and the need to financially care for the family caused many women to seek jobs outside the home to supplement their husbands' income. Some people characterized these wage-earning, married women as greedy and as taking jobs away from those more in need of money (Kwolek-Folland, 1998; Margolis, 2000). However, as a source of cheap labor, women were able to work in "inferior places in the labor force [that] were now preserved for them... [in] jobs that men could not get" (Kessler-Harris, 1982, p. 251).⁶

According to Kessler-Harris (1982), the Depression years carried a double standard for women in paid work. Familial financial pressures pushed women into the workforce, but at the same time women were pressed to stay out of the work force in order to leave jobs open for the men. This confusing message raised many issues concerning women and work, including prescribed male and female roles, the issue of whether women competing for men's jobs would lessen men's economic opportunities, and whether paid work "was a gender-based privilege or a human right" (Kessler-Harris, 1982, p. 254).

Even though there were many underlying issues that revolved around women and wage-work, the 1930s were also a time when progress took place. The 1933 National Industry Recovery Act attempted to regulate employment by implementing a minimum wage

⁶ Even though these were hard times economically and many women felt the need to work, most women's attitudes toward work revolved around the concept that most would work for a while and then retire when they married. Most women saw jobs as only temporary and a transition between girlhood and marriage or until something better came along. Society "approved" of careers for married women, only if they remained without children. In the 1930s, housework and domesticity remained a "woman's best career if she wanted to be 'deeply, fundamentally, wholly feminine'" (Margolis, 2000, p. 138).

for both men and women. The act also placed regulations on the number of hours per week a person could work. Since these codes included women, unions increasingly, although begrudgingly, added women to their organizations. The unions, again reluctantly, helped to protect women's jobs and gave benefits such as seniority, adequate pay, and paid vacations (Kessler-Harris, 1982, p. 269). These acts, codes, and regulations were important, but they only benefited those involved in industry work. It did not benefit the great numbers of women employed outside of industry, such as domestic servants or home workers.

The women's wear industry, although affected by the Depression, provided jobs for 350,000 workers in 41 states. The largest branch of the women's wear industry was dress manufacturing, which "hired more workers and accounted for a greater proportion of total production value-wise" (Richards, 1951, p. 27) than the rest of the apparel industry branches. In 1937, women made up the majority of the workers in the ready-to-wear industry. Most of the jobs that women held in the apparel industry, the basic stitching operations and other semi-skilled labor, did not require a college degree. Men worked in the apparel industry and made up two-thirds of the workers in the cloak-making trade and the more highly paid occupations such as cutter (Richards, 1951). According to Donahue (2000), fashion design was considered a higher-level job, and from the 1920s on, "a career in fashion design offered women prestige and authority" (p. 108).

Between 1930 and 1950, manufacturing continued to grow rapidly and the level of consumerism also increased. Media began to tailor advertisements to women because of their importance as consumers in the economy (Kwolek-Folland, 1998; Ogden, 1986). Some businesses turned to them, giving college-educated, professional women opportunities in management, product development, and customer service. More women could enter these

jobs in the business sector in part because of the widespread availability of higher education (Kwolek-Folland, 1998).

The 1940s brought a time of war to the United States and a time of change for women. World War II created many opportunities for women to enter the workforce in positions typically considered “masculine.” As men became more involved in the military preparing for the inevitable conflict, women entered the workforce to fill positions vacated by men. At the beginning of the war, supervisors filled these positions with women acting as volunteers. Employers were reluctant to allow women to fill production jobs because they felt women were unsuited (Kessler-Harris, 1982). However, the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into the war changed attitudes toward wage-work. As more men were shipped overseas for fighting, many positions opened up in the work force. Propaganda promoted women’s participation in the labor force as patriotic, exciting, and glamorous. Manufacturers recruited women by offering incentives such as on-site daycare centers, hot lunches, and convenient transportation. This propaganda, which touted the need for women workers, made it seem as if women joined the workforce in huge numbers.

Although many women did join the workforce, many of those who did were not new to paid jobs outside the home. In fact, “less than five million of the nineteen million women who worked for wages at some time during the war emergency had not been in the labor force before the war began” (Kessler-Harris, 1982, p. 276). In the ready-to-wear industry, the war did not affect the women’s wear industry as much as it did the men’s. The need for wedding dresses, bridesmaid dresses, maternity clothes, and work uniforms or office attire increased during WWII, due to the large number of war brides. The men’s industry lost a large number of potential consumers due to soldiers being shipped overseas. As a result, it

turned to the production of uniforms (Richards, 1951).

Even though increasing numbers of women joined the workforce, the attraction for women to stay home remained strong. The war effort at home still involved many men, and a large number of women still believed that they should not enter the job market because staying at home was the highest and most important duty, leaving husbands to be the main breadwinners. Traditionalist thinkers saw women as a way of bringing stability to the country by providing security in their homes. By staying at home and refusing to enter the labor force, women could better protect their children and instill in them proper morals. The “changes in women’s roles caused by the war created considerable anxiety about the stability and durability of the family” (Anderson, 1981, p. 10). As a result, femininity and traditional family roles became highly prized and promoted during the war, and even more so after the war was over (Anderson, 1981). These familial roles “encouraged the perception that women did not need to work and thus only worked to pay for extras or personal luxuries - pin money”⁷ (Kwolek-Folland, 1998, p. 137).

Although the struggle to combine the new, emerging roles for women with more traditional roles continued, the war benefited women’s wage-work in the long run. Blackwelder (1997) stated, “The war so profoundly altered labor demands and women’s expectations that women entered the workforce in even greater numbers after the war” (p. 123). Kessler-Harris (1981) offered a different point of view about women’s working conditions after World War II. She stated that, at the end of the war, there was a focus on

⁷ The argument of working for “pin money” goes back to the mid-19th century and was almost always a myth. Working for pin money meant that a woman worked for extra money to buy small luxuries, not because she was forced to work for economic reasons.

bringing the family back together coupled with the fear that there wouldn't be enough jobs for returning servicemen. These influences brought added pressure on women who worked outside the home. Despite the critical issues surrounding women's wage work, the majority of women chose to continue to work.⁸ After the war ended, many women were pushed out of the workforce to open up jobs for those men returning from the war. Although women left the workforce at the end of World War II, willingly or unwillingly, many eventually returned to wage-earning work.⁹ But most women did not return to the jobs they previously held, moving away from heavy industrial jobs and some manufacturing industries to find more "feminine" occupations as librarians, teachers, office workers, and social workers, as well as positions in the health and service industries (Kessler-Harris, 1981).¹⁰

The war changed the way that women viewed their abilities in capacities other than

⁸ "The end of the war produced another crisis. A newly affluent society renewed its pressure on women to stay in their homes. Still focused on the disintegrating family, and fearful that there would not be enough jobs for men...if a woman expressed disinterest in working in the home, she was labeled psychically maladjusted, unpatriotic, antimale and 'feminist.'" (Kessler-Harris, 1981, p. 128)

⁹ "Women did not seem to want to stop working. They were eased out. Seventy-five percent of those interviewed during the war years and the demobilization period overwhelmingly declared their desire to continue in their jobs...Shortly after women had been forcibly retired from the new jobs they had held during the war, they began to reappear in the labor force." (Kessler-Harris, 1981, p. 143) Kennedy (1999) offered another point of view about how women viewed work outside the home after the war. He states that a poll of former women war workers, taken by the Census Bureau in 1951, showed that half of them gave up work for "family responsibilities" (p. 780). Full-scale interviews of several of those women showed that 76 percent of them "positively welcomed the transition from employment to motherhood" (p. 780).

¹⁰ The widespread availability of jobs and higher wages during the war brought some women a sense of economic independence, but the rising cost of living after the war and the family's new dependence on women's wages when the war ended forced some women to look for employment (Blackwelder, 1997; Kessler-Harris, 1982). Those that decided to stay in the workforce faced competition from returning servicemen (Anderson, 1981). However, those women that continued in their jobs faced hostility from their male co-workers because of their supposed lack of femininity and lack of respect for traditional male and female roles, thus forcing some women to take lower paying jobs (Blackwelder, 1997; Kessler-Harris, 1982).

homemaking, such as work outside the home.¹¹ During the war, women took over more “masculine” jobs, and proved that they were capable in those roles. These jobs may have helped women to see the wide variety of occupations they were capable of fulfilling, outside of the more “feminine” occupations. Even though the war affected the view of women, there was still strong societal pressure to keep women in the home (See Table 2).

The 1950s are often remembered as a decade committed to the family and a time when women stayed home to take care of their families. American women were expected to act as the center of home life, and were often criticized for their desire for wage-work. This caused “conflicting emotions-frustration and boredom if they stayed at home, guilt if they

Table 2: Women’s Participation in the Labor Force^a

Year	Total Number of Women Workers in the Labor Force	Women Laborers as Percentage of Total Female Population	Women as a Percentage of the Labor Force
1940 ^b	12,887,000	25.4	24.4
1950 ^c	18,412,000	33.9	29.0
1960	23,272,000	37.8	32.5
1970	31,560,000	43.4	37.2
1980	45,611,000	51.5	42.0

^a Source: Wilson, P. (Ed.). (1992, July). Salaried and professional women: Relevant statistics publication #92-3. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. p. 2.

^b Labor force for 1940 includes those 14 years of age and older.

^c Labor force for the years 1950 to 1980 includes those 16 years of age and older.

¹¹ Homemaking, as defined in this paper, includes “the supervising and carrying out of responsibilities in the home that develop values in the family members, furthering good human relations both in the home and in contacts which family members have outside the home, and providing a satisfying setting for family living” (Hall, 1958, p. 78-9). Homemaker is defined as “one that makes a home: one whose occupation is household and family management” (Gove, 1981, p. 1083).

went out to work” (Blackwelder, 1997, p. 149). In The Feminine Mystique, Betty Friedan tried to identify this dissatisfaction, or the “problem that had no name,” that women as homemakers often felt. Friedan (1963) felt that women did not feel fulfilled being just homemakers, relying on their husbands for financial security; they wanted more than a husband, home, and children. Friedan also sensed that society was wrong in portraying the idea that a career other than homemaking was not feminine and that it took away from raising a healthy family (1963). But, these differing viewpoints did not keep women out of the work force. Instead, more women worked full time jobs, rather than the part time jobs that allowed them to have more time to take care of familial needs.

Wage-earning work became more central to women’s lives in the 1950s, in contrast to work earlier in the century that was often a short interlude in women’s lives before marriage or children came. The number of women in the labor force increased due to shortages created by men continuing in military service and the increase in production needs. This ultimately created more opportunities for women to enter the job market. The most severe shortages in workers were reported, among others, in nursing, teaching, and clerical work (Kessler-Harris, 1982) (See Table 3).

During this period, more and more women graduated from college and prepared for careers. However, great dissatisfaction often followed graduation due to the limited number of occupational choices for women during the 1950s. Some firms refrained from hiring women graduates because they believed that women would not stay in the workforce very long because of marriage and familial obligations. Studies on college graduates in 1957 show that only “21% planned to work continually, 55% intended to work discontinually, and 24% had no intention of working in the future” (Goldin, 1990, p. 207). The American

Table 3: Employment of women^a by major occupational group, 1940-1983^b

Major Occupation Group	1940	1950	1960	1970	1983
White-collar workers	5,648	8,627	11,831	17,438	29,847
Professional, technical & kindred workers	1,608	2,007	2,793	4,398	7,640
Managers, officials & proprietors	414	700	794	1,034	3,490
Clerical & kindred workers	2,700	4,502	6,497	9,910	13,100
Salesworkers	925	1,418	1,746	2,097	5,617
Manual & Service workers	6,419	7,217	8,786	10,793	13,608
Manual workers	2,720	3,685	4,006	5,041	5,282
Craftsman, foremen & kindred workers	135	253	268	524	1,000
Operative & kindred workers	2,452	3,287	3,612	4,223	3,585
Laborers, except farm & mine	133	145	125	295	697
Service workers	3,699	3,532	4,780	5,752	8,326
Private household	2,277	1,459	1,760	1,103	942
Service workers, except private household	1,422	2,073	3,020	4,649	7,170
Farmworkers	508	601	390	222	592 ^c
Dressmakers and Seamstresses (not in factory) ^d	162	134	120	128 ^e	104 ^f

^a Numbers in thousands of women 14 years of age and over.

^b Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1975). Historical statistics of the United States, colonial times to 1970, Bicentennial edition, part 2. Washington, D.C. p. 140; U. S. Department of Labor. (1994). 1993 Handbook on women workers: Trends and issues. p. 19.

^c Farmworkers for 1983 includes forestry and fishing.

^d Sources: US Department of Commerce. (1950). Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 71 ed., Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. pp. 186-187.; US Department of Commerce. (1960). Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 81 ed., Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. pp. 220-221.; US Department of Commerce. (1970). Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 91 ed., Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. pp. 228-229.; US Department of Commerce. (1980). Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 101 ed., Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. pp. 420-421.

^e Figure shown is for 1972.

^f Figure shown is for 1979.

culture that romanticized courtship and marriage reinforced this idea of not working continuously. During the 1950s and early 1960s, many girls went to college to find a husband, and once married often did not finish school. Some of those women who did finish college saw their degree as something to “fall back on” in case their husband should die or the family run into serious financial difficulties (Ogden, 1986).

Legislators and employers worked to improve women’s position in the workforce, enacting laws to enable women to have equal access to jobs and equal pay.¹² Many universities understood the female labor market was on the rise and added courses necessary to meet women’s demands. Discrimination was also a problem for women in higher education. Men received most of the university’s scholarship money and admissions until Title IX of the 1972 Higher Education Act took effect in 1975 (Blackwelder, 1997).¹³

Women advanced in the business area as the number of available educational opportunities increased. As a result, more women graduated from high school, college, university, and trade schools. “Between 1960 and 1990 women came to outnumber men as

¹² Policies regarding sexual discrimination in the work place were enacted in the 1960s. In 1963, the Equal Pay Act passed which prohibited discrimination in wages between men and women. In 1964, the Civil Rights Act included the term “sex” in the clause prohibiting employers to discriminate on account of religion, race, sex, and ethnicity. With the passing of the Civil Rights Act, infractions of the law could be prosecuted (Goldin, 1990; Kessler-Harris, 1982; Reskin & Hartmann, 1986). By 1969 forty-six states had protective legislation concerning women and their chosen occupations. Each state had different laws and regulations controlling the hours a woman could work and when she could work those hours, maximum weights that women could lift, and some employers even had to provide seats for women workers. Originally, these laws and regulations set out to help women gain equal access to jobs, but sometimes they actually worked against women trying to be hired. Companies sometimes cited these regulations as reasons to refuse to hire women because they did not fit the job description and could not hold up to the rigors of the job (Gates, 1976).

¹³ Title IX of the 1972 Higher Education Act “prohibited against discrimination. No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (United States Department of Labor, n.d., Section 1681, Sex).

recipients of associate's, bachelor's, and master's degrees" (Kwolek-Folland, 1998, p. 175).

More women entered traditionally male dominated fields, such as the biological sciences and management, but most women could still be found working in the traditionally feminine fields of education, healthcare, and the arts fields (Kwolek-Folland, 1998).

A 1964 survey, jointly conducted by the Women's Bureau and the National Vocational Guidance Association, studied women who graduated from college. The study showed that seven years after graduation 51 percent of the women graduates were part of the work force, and more than 75 percent indicated that they would be interested in furthering their education. By looking at the population as a whole in 1965, 58 percent of all women college graduates found employment outside of the home.¹⁴ Along with being employed outside the home, most of the women surveyed believed that their education was relevant to their current job in 1964 (United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1971).

Although many changes and advances took place in the labor force,¹⁵ the predominant belief in the 1970s still held that women should consider the home their major responsibility. Nonetheless, an increasing number of women joined the work force and held full time jobs during the 1970s (Tables 1, 2). Shapiro and Shaw (1982) showed that there was a substantial increase in the number of young, Caucasian women who entered the work force between 1967 and 1973. In 1967 Caucasian women between the ages of 30 and 34

¹⁴ In 1940, about 1.5 million women had obtained a college degree. In 1965, more than 4 million women were college graduates (United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1971).

¹⁵ Societal unrest, coupled with the feminist movement of the 1960s, had many results which ranged from "legislation attempting to ensure sexual equality in pay, to changing cultural norms that transformed 'career woman' from an epithet to a compliment, to scientific studies showing the pervasiveness of gender stereotypes in the educational process and the negative consequences thereof" (Hesse-Barber & Carter, 2000, p. 97).

comprised 44 percent of the workforce, and by 1978 60 percent of the women in this category were part of the workforce. The study also revealed that women's perceptions of the work force changed so that working outside the home for wages became acceptable for noneconomical reasons (Shapiro & Shaw, 1982). Expectations about women's wage-work as well as the necessity for women to choose between family or work outside the home began to lessen.

Some occupations, like teaching home economics, "paralleled" home life and enhanced domestic duties. The public stereotypes of women not only kept them in the home, but also portrayed them as being unassertive, lacking strength, endurance, dexterity, and with a natural tendency toward morality. These stereotypes were often the basis for excluding women from certain occupations, such as lawyers, doctors, insurance agents, among many others, and for keeping them in some of the lower paying jobs that demanded these characteristics (Kessler-Harris, 1982; Matthaei, 1982; Reskin & Hartmann, 1986).

Women moved into many stereotypically male roles, in spite of the negative attitudes that surrounded this movement. Women sought employment in medicine, law, real estate, management, and as university professors. By making inroads into certain aspects of typically masculine jobs, women entering these jobs split them into masculine and feminine aspects, tending to focus on certain topics. In medicine, women were more likely to be found in family practice. In law, most women specialized in family and divorce law. Although women were university professors and in management, the majority did not hold the highest positions: as full professors, department heads, or in top management positions

(Matthaei, 1982).¹⁶

Even though the number of women in the work force increased, most women still held jobs considered stereotypically female (See Table 3). Lower pay and little opportunity for advancement often characterized these jobs. However, average hourly wages increased, which was not only due to more education, but also “more favorable attitudes toward women working outside the home”¹⁷ (Shapiro & Shaw, 1982, p. 104). In spite of the increase in hourly wages, there was still a sharp difference between male and female wages. For example, in 1972 the median annual income “was \$11,806 for male college graduates, but only \$7,878 for women” (Griffiths, 1976, p. 7) in the professional and technical fields.

Women’s inroads into wage-earning work and education were great, but the struggle to conform to images of women’s roles made it a difficult transition. Historically, many women found wage-earning work in the apparel industry, and the struggle of a woman’s role in the home and at work affected this field. The area of fashion design created a career for women that not only gave them wage-work outside the home, but also provided them with a certain sense of pride and prestige since designing was one of the higher positions within the apparel industry. It was also a career that fit into the traditional definitions of women’s roles, focused as it was on the production of clothing. The history of women’s work would not be

¹⁶ “The penetration of women into men’s jobs in the twentieth century has been uneven, as would be expected. In some professions, women have taken over the more feminine subfields...in others, women remain clustered in the lower ranks ...The sex-typing of jobs is simply reconstituting itself differently; masculine jobs are being splintered into masculine and feminine jobs. When we recall that the overwhelming majority of all such positions were monopolized by men at the beginning of this century, this fact represents a clear and steady progression of women into men’s jobs” (Matthaei, 1982, p. 292).

¹⁷ Shapiro and Shaw’s (1982) study focused on married women between the ages of 30 and 34. The average hourly wages was compiled based on these married women. In 1978, the wages were about 60 cents per hour higher than in 1967.

complete without looking at the apparel industry.

Brief History of the Apparel Industry and Women's Education for Apparel Design

Clothing production played an important role in the history of women's work both in the home and for wages. Among the leading fields of women's work from 1870-1910 were dressmakers, seamstresses, or milliners. Women found work in these fields because of their ties to domesticity and their acceptance as "feminine" occupations. There was a drop in the number of women workers in the apparel industry as a whole from 1910-1930, but women continued to constitute the majority of workers in the apparel industry. The majority of women worked in semi-skilled factory positions; and by 1940 workers in the apparel industry "constituted the largest single group of women in manufacturing" (Hooks, 1978, p. 113).¹⁸

In the apparel industry, work conditions were harsh and wages were low. Even with these poor working conditions, women worked in the industry out of necessity. Kessler-Harris (1982) characterized the kind of women employed in the apparel industry.¹⁹ The majority of women working in the apparel industries was mostly young and unskilled, and worked only until they married.²⁰ They were mostly immigrants that employers often exploited with low pay and poor working conditions (Kessler-Harris, 1982).

A class-based hierarchy existed in needlework, in general. The lowest level consisted

¹⁸ In 1940 there were 757,552 women clothing workers. This number includes women operatives and laborers in apparel factories, dressmakers and tailoresses (Hooks, 1978).

¹⁹ These characteristics of women in the apparel industry are reasons Kessler-Harris mentions in explaining why women were not as actively involved in trade unions.

²⁰ "At the turn of the century, 87 percent of female workers were unmarried and nearly half were under twenty-five" (Kessler-Harris, 1982, p. 153).

struggled with training young women, who were usually single, for wage-earning jobs that were generally short-term versus training for a long-term “career” in homemaking (Powers, 1992). Since a college degree was not typically necessary for work in the design and dressmaking fields, vocational education provided women with the skills training they needed so they would be better equipped for wage-work in the apparel fields.

Many vocational schools offered an almost exclusive focus on education for women interested in learning the dressmaking or millinery trades, although some schools also trained for factory sewing in the apparel industry. Initially there was little focus on clothing design, but as the women’s ready-to-wear industry expanded in the late nineteenth century, the concept of fashion design “as an artistic practice with institutions and conventions” (Donahue, 2000, p. 109) was born.

According to Donahue (2000), the term “fashion designer,” referring to a creator of garments, was not widely used until the 1950s, although there is evidence of the use of the two decades earlier. Before the 1950s, a fashion designer was often called a “costume designer,” “clothing designer,” “dressmaker,” or “garment-maker” (p. 108). Although the conceptualization of fashion design took place during this period, it was not yet prevalent as an occupation for women. It was typically considered feminine partly due to society’s view of women and their roles in making clothes for the family. Because a college degree was not necessary for a career in fashion design, formal training for fashion design evolved into two distinct phases: “to train designers for the wholesale and retail garment trade in the area of mass production” and to train “for dressmaker establishments” (Donahue, 2000, p.109).

At the Girls’ Trade School of Boston and the Manhattan Trade School for Girls, courses in millinery, dressmaking, machine garment making, and machine hat making were

of those working in factories producing shirts and underwear and tailoring, while trade work, dressmaking, and millinery were often associated with a middle level within the hierarchy. Artistic needlework done by hand for household decoration was considered more genteel, and accorded the highest status (Parsons, 2004).

The period of 1910 to 1940 showed a large decrease in the numbers of dressmakers.²¹ Almost 400,000 left the dressmaking trade, but at the same time, about 350,000²² additional women entered apparel factories to work as operatives and laborers. Training and education in the new field of fashion design centered on designing feminine apparel and moved away from learning professional dressmaking techniques and handiwork intended for home use. This not only created a new vocation for women but also feminized the profession as training focused on designing women's garments (Donahue, 2000).

Vocational education

An important development in women's formal education and training for the apparel industry was the growth of technical training or vocational education. The vocational education movement gained momentum in the early twentieth century, and prepared women for wage-work in a variety of occupations, including in the apparel industry. The purpose of vocational education was to train young men and women for wage-earning work. Although that was the main purpose, the controversy over women's roles in education, work, and the home pervaded vocational education just as it did home economics education. Educators

²¹ In 1910, there were 550,745 women working as dressmakers and seamstresses outside of the factories, while in 1940, there were only 162, 247 (Hooks, 1978).

²² In 1910, there were 206,923 women operatives and laborers working in apparel and accessories, and by 1940 there were 549,588 (Hooks, 1978).

taught in 1910, although other schools offered similar courses prior to 1910.²³ The design and sewing courses were closely related to trade work, so students' work paralleled that of the industry. Students learned proper dressmaking skills and took courses in mathematics, business English, athletics, and cooking (Ripley, 1910). The philosophy of many of these vocational schools was to train women for useful skills needed in the home.

Between 1910 and 1925, new schools emerged for the training of fashion designers. Among these new schools were The New York School of Fine and Applied Art, Cooper Union, the Fashion Academy, Inc., Metropolitan Art School, the Traphagen School of Fashion, and Grand Central School of Art. These new programs were the result of a growing interest in American design. Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York and the New York School of Design formed with the intent to train "designers for the wholesale and retail garment trade in the area of mass production, as well as for dressmaker establishments" (Donahue, 2000, p. 109) by offering courses in dress-making, illustration, and costume design. According to Walls (1994), by obtaining an education in art, a woman not only enhanced her opportunities for future employment, but also her opportunities for marriage because of her artistic abilities. Professional training in fashion design often gave students a way to "evade the confines of domesticity while retaining the appearance of gentility associated with unpaid work in the home" (Walls, 1994).

During the course of World War I, there was fear that the Paris fashion industry would be suspended and concern that America was not ready to take over the creative aspects

²³ Charity organizations in Baltimore provided formal sewing instruction in the mid-nineteenth century. For example, in 1871 Henry Watson Children's Aid Society operated the Free Sewing Schools, and the Electric Sewing Rooms taught some women to use power sewing machines in 1891 (Parsons, 2004).

of the industry (Donahue, 2000). Up until this time most American dressmakers and ready-to-wear designers copied or adapted Parisian designs for the American customer. If Paris was cut off, there was fear that there would be a deficit of new fashion from France.

Although Paris was never occupied, the fear of France's occupation and possible lack of new designs contributed to the rise of the popularity of fashion design and the increasing number of schools that offered fashion design, as well as an increased interest in promoting American design and designers.

Schools began to give students expertise in the practical side of fashion design. For example, the Philadelphia School of Design supplemented its core curriculum in design with fashion illustration. The School of Design aimed to prepare their students for careers in teaching or commercial design. In the 1920s, the school shifted away from teaching fine arts and art education toward the industrial applications of art. By 1922, 70 percent of students chose the commercial courses in textile design and fashion and costume illustration, among others, rather than art education and fine arts (Walls, 1994). Another example of how programs implemented design teaching was the curriculum at the New York School of Fine and Applied Art. This school focused on the technical aspect of design, but used fashion illustration as the basis for design. Garment construction, draping, and design courses followed the fashion illustration courses (Donahue, 2000).

Design schools and liberal arts colleges had similar curricular goals before the 1920s. But by 1920, design schools offered an education that led to a distinct career path in fashion design, while liberal arts colleges worked to avoid the negative perception of vocational training, and instead offered academic training to students that "might" be used in careers (Walls, 1994).

Fine arts graduates, for the most part, could rely on family support and felt free to follow their artistic leanings without regard to vocational goals. Commercial design students, in contrast, often planned to support themselves; they expected practical, market-oriented courses leading to permanent employment. (Walls, 1994, p. 332)

The differences between liberal arts colleges and design schools often meant that students who attended these two types of educational institutions had different goals. The liberal arts colleges, while teaching textiles and clothing courses that could have been used toward a career in fashion design, offered a well-rounded education and a “variety of extracurricular activities designed to mold character as well as to educate” (Walls, 1994, p. 354). The design schools, often located in cities where jobs in design were readily available, offered students practical skills to prepare them for jobs in the apparel industry (Walls, 1994).

By the 1940s, the fashion industry began to demand well-trained college graduates, as the earlier design programs were not all four-year programs. A professor at Pratt Institute, Henrietta Harman, wrote an article detailing the fashion industry’s increased demand for schools that had good clothing design programs. A good clothing design program gave students an understanding of manufacturers’ needs in both production areas and consumer areas. According to Harman (1943), most colleges did not teach design with this commercial point of view, due to time limitations or to the inability to study the market firsthand. She challenged educators to equip students so that they could enter the industry knowledgeable about manufacturing practices and limitations. Pratt Institute taught costume design, and in the mid-1940s, their graduates found jobs as designers, teachers of clothing and costume design, and manufacturing work. The same was true of Traphagen and the New York School of Fine and Applied Art (Picken, 1943).

Even before the occupation of Paris during World War II, Americans recognized the

need for American designers. The importance of American design grew through the 1930s, and the industry reacted to the fear that Paris might be cut off during the war. The mayor of New York City formed a committee to research the building of a world fashion center in New York City (Picken, 1941). The entry of the United States into World War II not only allowed women many opportunities for working in a variety of jobs; it also created an opportunity for American fashion designers to come to the forefront. Until World War II, Paris was the center of fashion, and American women looked to Parisian designs for inspiration. When France was under the control of the Germans, it gave American designers the opportunity to promote their own designs (Buckland, 1996). New York emerged as the center for fashion in the United States as designers worked to establish their own identity rather than copying Parisian designs or selling under Parisian names (Milbank, 1989). The United States government supported and even promoted the fashion industry since it was an economically viable industry. The government also placed restrictions on garments as a way of rationing fabric for use in the military.²⁴ This gave American designers opportunities to design garments that would fit within governmental regulations, providing additional reasons for consumers to purchase American designs (Buckland, 1996).

After the war, Parisian design influence once again spread to the United States. However, this time, American designers became more firmly established and created fashions for American women that were not only beautiful, but functional (Cain, 1950). By the 1960s, American designers became nationally publicized through retail establishments and consumer and trade publications, and began to create a name for themselves not only

²⁴ The government placed limits on the amount of fabric a garment could use. This eliminated unnecessary features such as patch pockets, wide hems, and cuffs.

nationally but also abroad (Arnold & White, 1961).

Career advice for prospective fashion designers

An examination of career literature suggests the educational expectations to enter jobs in fashion design. Although the apprenticeship system for dressmakers was not widely used past the turn of the twentieth century, experience in the apparel industry proved helpful and even sometimes necessary. In general, career advice literature focused on three criteria needed to become a designer: inherent ability, formal education, and industry experience. These three components were repeated throughout the twentieth century, although there was a shift away from reliance on inherent ability toward the necessity of a formal design education.

The School of Applied Design for Women's program in art focused on giving women an education that had an "immediate commercial value." They planned to enlarge the school since they felt that "the call for competent designers is now greater than the supply" (Woman's work, 1905, n.p.). Advice from 1910 suggested that a woman needed a natural ability for designing before undertaking fashion design as a career. Along with this natural ability for design, Hattersley (1910) believed that design students should take at least one year of training in costume drawing and pattern drafting, although more education would give more knowledge of technical aspects of design and a better basis for a career.

Similarly, in 1920, McGowan (1920) offered the advice that in order to be a good designer, a woman needed "natural qualifications for the work such as good taste, originality, imagination, keen sense of color, and courage to carry out her own ideas" (p. 58). Although McGowan suggested that some of these credentials come from years of experience and

training, part of design talent should come naturally. Training of at least one year at a design school, but preferably two years would give the young designer the education necessary to become successful (McGowan, 1920).

By the 1930s, the focus began to shift to a need for more formal education.

Reflecting that shift, Oglesby (1935) wrote about fashion careers for Americans, and believed that women should get as much education as possible. Along with an education, the student needed to travel in order to widen their base of knowledge, add cultural background, and cultivate their abilities to use their knowledge. Oglesby thought that a well-rounded designer not only possessed creative talent, but also had skills in the business world. Oglesby's reliance on education for design was a change from earlier career advice that promoted a limited education to gain specific skills needed in the industry.

Prior to World War II, few early American designers attended design schools, and instead gained their knowledge and experience by working their way through various jobs in the apparel industry (Sartoris, 1948). In addition to education and natural ability, Sloop (1947) believed that experience in the industry was a necessary component to a good designer. She thought that potential designers needed to see how fashion design was carried out on a daily basis, to strip away the glamour, and to allow students to see the hard work that goes into designing. Sloop also believed that in order to get a job in fashion design, a student needed to possess leadership skills, good health, and enthusiasm. Picken (1941) identified a need for American designers and encouraged teachers to lead students toward careers in fashion design. She called on students to persevere in their education to become great designers. In the field of apparel design, many schools taught design that would prepare graduates for any career in ready-to-wear industry.

Career opportunities for women, some of which the war provided, helped give students a foothold in professional jobs after graduation (Hawthorne, 1984). Mayme Sartoris, a designer in St. Louis, Missouri, outlined the qualifications that a good designer should have before entering the industry, all of which could be obtained at a good school. She stated that knowledge of design theory, history of costume and art, garment construction, color theory, pattern drafting and draping, an understanding of the fashion industry, and work experience were some of the basic principles that a graduate needed in order to be a good designer (Sartoris, 1948).

In home economics career advice literature, authors encouraged students to take a wide variety of courses, such as art, advertising, psychology, economics, bookkeeping, and personnel management, among others (Phillips, 1957). Along with a liberal education in home economics, there were specific courses that could lead to a career in design. A thorough knowledge of pattern drafting, clothing construction, fabric, and the history of costume provided a solid basis from which to start a career in fashion design. Experience was also considered a necessary tool for a successful fashion design career and could be gained through an apprenticeship in a factory, work with a tailor or dressmaker, and designing clothes for self as well as family and friends while still in college (Tate, 1961).

Schools that specialized in teaching apparel design were also a source of new designers. Cain (1950) stated that the design schools became “more specialized and more adequate than they were when the industry was younger” (p. 111). Cain saw specialized training in fashion design as necessary in order to qualify for a position in the industry since apprenticeships in the industry were no longer feasible due to minimum wage laws. Cain also believed that the growing trend of cooperation between design schools and the apparel

industry benefited the student by providing opportunities to gain knowledge of the industry and contacts within the industry (1950).

Even though a student attained both a college education and experience in the industry, breaking into the design field was often difficult. Humphreyville (1963) believed that it was hard to enter the fashion design field, although a student with contacts in the industry would have an easier time finding a job after graduation. There were few employment agencies that helped graduates find jobs in the apparel industry in the 1960s, which made it harder to find design jobs without contacts in the industry. The graduate of home economics in the 1960s may also have had more trouble finding employment because they competed against graduates of fashion design schools and art schools whose programs tended to be more technical in nature than those programs in home economics. While employment in fashion design proved competitive, a career in design offered women the opportunity to become influential in making decisions about manufacturing (Humphreyville, 1963).

Women worked in the apparel industry throughout history, and schools offering an education in apparel design flourished as women viewed designing as a way to rise above expectations of women in the workforce. These changing perceptions not only influenced women and work, but also had an effect on home economics. Home economists struggled for years to provide an education for women that would enable them to fulfill their roles in either wage-earning work or domestic responsibilities, or both, while art and design schools offered a more focused education in design.

Brief History of Home Economics

Home economics played an important role in the higher education of women. As higher education for women moved forward at a steady pace, the controversy continued on what subject matter was appropriate to teach young women. The quandary over providing education for future vocations or for creating and developing life skills that could be used in the home was one of the main points in the struggle for “correct” academic content. Home economists recognized this struggle and attempted to create a program to fill both of these needs in women’s higher education. This is one of the reasons why home economics has such a unique, and at times a controversial, history.

The changing perceptions of women’s work and education affected curricula in home economics. The issue of women’s roles was central to the teaching of home economics, and educators attempted to adapt curricula both to this dualistic role and to women’s changing needs.²⁵ In order to understand how society influenced the development of home economics, and textiles and clothing programs within home economics, it is necessary to examine how and why home economics began. This section will give a brief history of home economics, looking specifically at its development, goals, and image. This background will provide context for the following section, an in-depth look at the textiles and clothing curricula, which developed within home economics.

Nine annual conferences starting in 1899, commonly called the Lake Placid Conferences, attempted to bring together the various disciplines related to domestic

²⁵ Home economics worked to find a balance between preparing women for employment outside the home as well as teaching skills believed necessary in providing a stable home life.

science,²⁶ as home economics was first named. Ellen Richards was one of the leaders for the first Lake Placid conference (East, 1980). Richards viewed “domestic science as a way to move women trained in science into employment in academics and industry” (Stage, 1997, p.5). She wanted to push the home economics discipline beyond the domestic economy focus on cooking and sewing and provide a more research based program derived from the natural and social sciences (Stage, 1997).²⁷ Richards wanted home economics to become a professional field for educated women (Stage, 1997). She understood household economics “as a distinct and important phase of the social economy” (Hunt, 1912, p. 286). From the Lake Placid Conferences, the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) formed in 1909. The AHEA was a “necessary component in formalizing the profession...with the stated purpose ‘the improvement of life conditions in the home, the institutional household and the community’” (Hawthorne, 1984, p. 4).

From 1909 to 1919 there was tremendous growth of home economics curricula in high schools and colleges. In 1912 “home economics” replaced “domestic economy” as the

²⁶ The division of labor, brought about by centralized production, not only affected men’s work, but also women’s work in the home. The idea that domesticity was a specialized industry was promoted with more frequency. Men were the primary wage earners for the family and women were the primary consumers. Increasing demands of time and the use of new technology were being placed on women and they didn’t have the necessary training to deal with these new demands (MacDonald & MacDonald, 1927).

²⁷ Ellen Richards was a champion for women in higher education and encouraged young women to become involved in science and to apply it to their lives through the Home Economics program. She was also involved in helping to create “more healthful industrial or factory environment, public health (sanitation, pure air, clean water), health conditions in public schools, and later, education for home life or home economics.” (Brown, 1993, p. 361) Her extensive knowledge in science, especially chemistry, gave early home economics a good basis and grounding in the application of science to this discipline (American Home Economics Association [AHEA], 1929). She believed that men and women should be educated to have an “intelligent interest in problems associated with food, ventilation, and home sanitation in general, and that every department of life should receive the benefit of applied science” (Richards, 1904, p.203).

official title. After some controversy over whether home economics should be considered a vocational program, the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act of 1917 included home economics, which helped to further expand the program. "The Act was a recognition that one-fourth of women over 10 years of age were gainfully employed and that home economics was concerned with occupational skills as well as homemaking" (Hawthorne, 1984, p. 4). The act provided federal funds for teacher preparation and training. This shaped home economics at the college level and brought about the concept of "homemaking as a vocation" (Carver, 1979, p. 22) and some of the dualistic problems.

In 1912, The Journal of Home Economics listed the professional vocations open to home economics graduates. Teaching was listed as the primary field open to graduates. The authors also identified new positions in food economics, dietetics, lunchroom management, institutional buying, and commercial laundry management. Commercial jobs for students in domestic art included interior decorating, costume design, professional shopping, dressmaking, and millinery. The professions within costume design were broken down further: designing in a tailoring establishment, positions in education, or designing for a newspaper or magazine (Technical opportunities in home economics, 1912).

Along with the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act, World War I brought increased attention to the professional aspect of home economics. Demand for women trained in dietetics, institutional management, and home economics increased as did the attention given to the need for conservation of food and clothing, sanitation, cost of living, and food values (Carver, 1979).

Interest in textiles, the need for standards to protect the consumer, standardization of women's clothing, and the conservation of clothing was also stimulated by the war. Federal support for home economics in education had been encouraged during the war as a result of widespread public recognition for its service in carrying out food conservation instruction in the Food Administration. (Carver, 1979, p. 23)

As home economics grew in popularity as a course of study, different subjects emerged. Child development and parent education came into existence during the 1920s, which meshed with home economics' mission to improve the family. The number of art application, clothing, and home design programs also increased. Research at this time emphasized efficiency of tasks within the home, child development, and consumption economics (Hawthorne, 1984).

In the first quarter of the century, home economics gained a foothold throughout the country. For example, between 1900 and 1926 enrollment in home economics at Iowa State College increased from 68 to 1,037. In 1913, the State Board of Education created a separate Division of Home Economics (Eppright & Ferguson, 1971). Applied Art, Foods and Nutrition, Household Administration, Institutional Administration, Textiles and Clothing, Home Economics Vocational Education, which included training teachers, and Physical Education were the departments identified in 1924 within the Home Economics Division at Iowa State College. Each had stated aims and objectives (Iowa State College [ISC], 1924). In 1927, the home economics curriculum at Iowa State College implemented a core involving applied art, child development, foods and nutrition, and clothing construction. This gave students a basic knowledge in all fields of home economics. Students also took courses in communication, physical and biological sciences, social sciences, and physical education (Eppright & Ferguson, 1971). The intent of this basic knowledge was to train teachers and to teach graduates to better serve and equip their families by running an efficient household.

Nationwide, during the 1930s home economics started to become more diversified professionally as women moved into areas of business, management, and service. As a result, home economics started to focus on business and social service sectors. The Depression caused the discipline to add extension programs that concentrated on helping families stretch their budgets through remaking clothes, planting gardens and preserving home grown food, and financial management (Hawthorne, 1984). The emphasis in home economics during this decade shifted away from “mechanics of the household to the functions of the family, from skills as ends to skills as means to ends, from...a subject to life situations, and from fixed practices to flexible procedures” (Carver, 1979, p. 28). During this decade, home economics remained centered on preparation for work in the home, although a shift toward professional preparation was beginning to emerge.

During World War II women held jobs in many industries, and further opportunities in textiles and clothing arose. A competition held for textile technologists in 1941 was one example of the types of jobs open for educated women in textiles and clothing. The U.S. Civil Service Commission announced their need for textile technologists to help in national defense work, and the subsequent competition for the position. Candidates were rated on their education and experience (News Notes, April 1941).

After the war, many women were not willing to give up their new independence in the workforce and sought education to reinforce their industrial positions. An education could enable them to compete with the waves of men returning from World War II. Consequently, college enrollment increased, as did enrollment in home economics' programs (Hawthorne, 1984).

Home economics slowly began to change in order to give women the necessary

education for professional jobs; however, the emphasis of the home economics program remained on having a satisfying family life. Although there was a strong emphasis on the family, there continued to be a number of home economics graduates who found work as teachers, dieticians, and extension workers. During the 1940s, there was also a renewed emphasis on consumer education, which involved teaching students to be wise and educated product consumers. Nystrom (1941) challenged home economics educators to take initiative in organizing their courses to provide for consumer education. This not only included current courses, but also coordinating with other departments that offered business, marketing, retailing, and advertising courses so that students would receive the complete knowledge they needed (Nystrom, 1941).

A seminar conducted in the summer of 1948 at Syracuse University explored ways to teach clothing courses “through increased knowledge and understanding of the forces that operate in providing families with garments that meet their needs, at prices they can afford to pay” (Brandau, Myers & Monroe, 1950, p. 106). One of the conclusions at the end of the seminar was that some of the subjects of clothing courses needed to be reorganized in order to teach students to be better consumer-buyers, and to include more information on production and distribution. Although there wasn’t specific mention of reorganizing apparel design programs, a new image of fashion designers also emerged from the seminar. Participants of the seminar felt that their image of garment and fabric designers changed from thinking of designers as “glamorous, impractical persons” to “‘hard-headed’ businesswomen and businessmen, skillful in interpreting fashion trends and in adapting fashion to quantity production, thus bringing fashion within reach of families of only moderate income” (Brandau, et.al., 1950, p. 107). This allowed a link to be created between the traditional

family focus of home economics programs and the apparel design career.

In the 1950s there was a renewed focus “on home, children, and family life, a flight to suburbia, and for many women a reduced focus on employment outside the home” (Hawthorne, 1984, p. 7). Much research in the areas of physical and biological sciences ultimately provided a plethora of different subjects within home economics. This fragmentation into many different subject areas caused criticism within the field because of the difficulty of integrating all subjects into one curriculum. In 1956 a committee from the AHEA set out to look at the beginnings of home economics and to see what the future held. Their report showed that home economics was primarily concerned with strengthening the family and its aesthetic, behavioral, and physical milieu. The report also pointed out that home economics as a field, focused on knowledge from its own research and from the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities as its main concern (Carver, 1979, p. 32). This suggests that home economics educators tried to provide both a general education and an education for students who wanted to pursue a professional job outside the home, yet still maintain a focus on the family.

Textiles and clothing educators held discussions during the 1950s in order to ascertain how to incorporate the family focus into clothing courses. The Eastern College Conference of Teachers of Clothing and Textiles met to discuss this topic and summarized their findings. They believed that there had been too much emphasis placed on the individual’s clothing needs in the past and that there needed to be more of an emphasis on the family and its clothing preferences. The attendees concluded that subjects such as budgeting, clothing choice, clothing needs and maintenance, along with the inclusion of educating men on these topics, were subjects to be added to their current course offerings (Whitlock & Morgan,

1952). The University of Washington was an example of incorporating a family focus into textiles and clothing, as it made an attempt to add a “family centered clothing course” in the early 1950s. Class projects involved studying a family member’s clothing problems, and looking at particular needs, clothing expenditures, plan for clothing purchases, and the values and satisfaction incurred with these purchases. Field trips to see the clothing industry and panels of experts helped students to understand the problems of consumers, producers, and distributors (Wybourn, 1952).

One of the challenges that educators ran into in the 1950s was that students still viewed a profession outside the home as secondary to the primary role of “full time homemaking and the producing of babies” (Hilton, 1975, n.p.). Jobs were not always viewed as careers, but as “supplements to marriage” (Hilton, 1975, n.p.). Until the 1960s, the main thrust of home economics education was to teach students to develop the knowledge needed to promote healthy family life. Historically, many people believed women’s participation in the labor force conflicted with marriage; therefore, before the 1960s, it was beneficial to educate women for their role as a wife and mother. The majority of home economics graduates worked for a relatively short period of time and then became wives and mothers (Hoeflin, Pence, Miller & Weber, 1981). This reflected the societal trend that many young women married soon after high school or college, worked until the first child arrived and then resumed work after children grew up (LeBaron, 1967). But as women’s life patterns changed over time, home economists realized that it would have to adapt its curricula in order to stay current (Sicherman, 1988).

During the 1960s, the stigma that home economics was mainly for women began to change, and slowly more men entered the program. Specializations within the home

economics program continued to expand. The art and design area was one specialization that grew larger. Other programs within home economics began to focus on special needs for the handicapped, elderly, and non-traditional family structures (Hawthorne, 1984). Skill training came under scrutiny, and many programs shifted from teaching specific skills to teaching concepts in their courses. The overall pattern “was a transition from homemaking to professional objectives” (Carver, 1979, p. 34) in order to adapt to new social needs. There were many job opportunities available to a graduate with a background in textiles and clothing. A national survey of jobs of home economics’ graduates listed these as their titles, among others: “sewing specialist, special projects coordinator-fashion department, assistant product manager...supervisor of design research, fabric coordinator, merchandise representative” (Wait, 1977, p. 45). This survey also found an increase in the number of home economists who worked in textiles and clothing businesses during the previous 10 years, and that their job roles expanded to add more responsibilities, more work load, and more laboratory research (Wait, 1977).

Course content and program emphases changed during the 1960s to meet industry needs (Frey, 1990; Hoeflin, et.al., 1981). Horn (1963) surveyed changes in home economics curricula and identified trends. She found that the “requirement in general or ‘core’ home economics’ courses was reduced, while at the same time greater attention was given to ‘depth’ or professional courses in the area of specialization” (Horn, 1963, p. 237). The shifts in emphases at the institutions studied included:

greater emphasis on consumer education and less emphasis on laboratory and manipulative skills. Greater emphasis was also being placed upon the following (listed here in order of frequency of mention: “professionalism,” “specialization,” “depth,” “management,” “socio-psychological aspects of clothing,” “generalizations and concepts,” “world problems,” “dietetics,” “family centeredness,” “short cuts and

quicker methods.)” ... The predominant pattern was a transition from homemaking to professional objectives. (Horn, 1963, p. 239)

Michigan State University reduced the home economics core requirements by 20 to 30 percent, and The Pennsylvania State University reduced the home economics core from 40 credits to 18 credits and increased professional requirements (Horn, 1963).

A study conducted on the future of home economics and an evaluation of the problems and objectives within home economics programs revealed that there wouldn't be a lesser need for those trained in home economics (McGrath & Johnson, 1968). Instead, it suggested that the occupations in teaching and nutrition would continue to grow in number. In order to prepare individuals for expanded opportunities, McGrath (February 1968) suggested that the undergraduate level courses be more general and expand to encompass current social problems.

Helen LeBaron (1961), at Iowa State, faced similar challenges. She wanted to emphasize the basic principles that served as guide lines to the home economist to interpret further research findings and future technological developments,²⁸ rather than focusing so heavily on traditional homemaking skills. Hoeflin, Pence, Miller, and Weber (1981) summarized the challenge that faced educators in home economics:

The continual challenge of home economists at the higher education level is to develop a more comprehensive philosophy and organizational structure on which to base programs that are different from other related areas of study and to identify and define the central concepts. A major emphasis continues to be finding the best way to serve home and families and to prepare professional home economists to meet the needs of communities and society. (p. 163)

²⁸ Helen R. LeBaron Hilton was the Dean of the Division of Home Economics from 1952 until 1975. Owing to her marriage to James H. Hilton in 1970, Helen LeBaron also wrote under the name Helen LeBaron Hilton. Where appropriate, her married name is used.

Even though homemaking was still considered important to the future, many home economics graduates found increased opportunities to specialize in an area in order to find employment in industry. This reflected the changing focus in women's lives as many moved into the professional job sector (LeBaron, 1961). During the 1970s there was an increase in the number of women who assumed that they could fulfill multiple roles, as mothers, as career minded women, or both (Hilton, 1975). By 1978, more than half of all intact families had two wage earners, compared with only one third in the 1950s (Kessler-Harris, 1981).

The Eleventh Lake Placid Conference discussed the role, name, and definition of home economics. In 1973, a new definition of home economics developed out of this conference. They defined home economics as "a profession and ... a practical science concerned with the home and family" (Hoeflin, et.al., 1981, p. 163). AHEA also launched an accreditation program for undergraduate curricula in higher education in order to assure a quality and professional course of study that encompassed common aspects of home economics (Hawthorne, 1984). Although there was increased attention on professional career preparation, many of these careers were based on traditional home economics fields rather than encompassing some of the professional, non-traditional fields in textiles and clothing.

The AHEA discussed reviewing the undergraduate curriculum for accreditation, but within textiles and clothing, educators also moved toward reviewing their programs. The Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing (ACPTC) formed in 1979 with the purpose of initiating professional growth and research, strengthening college teaching,

and developing future plans²⁹ (International Textile and Apparel Association [ITAA], n.d.). Many of the faculty members at Iowa State University participated in ACPTC and now are members of the International Textile and Apparel Association, as ACPTC came to be called.

During this period, home economics started to change in terms of the dualistic role. There was still some attention given to preparing women for work at home, but this declined. Educators struggled to maintain the focus of home economics education, which revolved around the home and family, while trying to respond to changes in the workforce and in women's educational needs. The labor force demanded more trained, educated workers; women responded to that need by enrolling and graduating from colleges and universities and moving into professional careers. As a result, home economics curricula slowly changed to meet these new demands.

Image of home economics

One of the problems of home economics programs was a concern over identity and status. Programs struggled with this from the very beginning. Catherine Beecher, Ellen Richards, and Mary Welch, along many others throughout its history, tried to convince the public of the need for home economics education (Creekmore, 1968). The problem of defining home economics and coming up with a name that encompassed all subject areas

²⁹ Although ACPTC became a corporation in 1979, they held annual meetings as early as 1944 as a result of a series of studies completed by the United States Office of Education in 1935 in response to the growing need for a strengthened textiles and clothing college curricula. It held its first annual meeting in 1944 and was incorporated in 1979. ACPTC was comprised of three regions, Central, Eastern, and Western, each of which held annual meetings to discuss "professional problems of mutual concern and interest" (Dickey, 1990, p. 2). In 1991, ACPTC became the International Textile and Apparel Association (ITAA), which reflected its global perspective and growing numbers of international members (ITAA, n.d.).

started in the early 1900s and continues today. The many changes in names for domestic economy reflected the modifications and struggles that took place within the field, as it attempted to adapt to an ever-changing society.

The field was first named Domestic Economy in the mid to late 1800s and then switched to Home Economics in 1899. Participants in the First Lake Placid Conference chose Home Economics, hoping the name would reflect the wide variety of subjects and themes within the field. Although it was officially named in 1899, the rest of the nine yearly conferences each reconsidered this new field of study (Carver, 1979). "There was not agreement among participants concerning interpretation of the aim of home economics, either in the view of what should be accomplished through education regarding the home or of what the nature of that education (process and content) should be" (Brown, 1985, vol.1, p. 321). Home Economics continued to be the name used until the late 1960s.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, some colleges dropped the name "Home Economics" because of the hidden meanings that it invoked. Many people related the term "Home Economics" to just cooking and sewing. In reality, the field was much more complex and encompassed many subjects (See Table 4).

Today, names include Human Ecology, Human Environmental Sciences, and Family and Consumer Sciences.³⁰ The difference in names in colleges throughout the United States

³⁰ At Iowa State University and Tennessee State University, home economics was renamed Family and Consumer Sciences. Virginia Polytechnic Institute changed their home economics department to College of Human Resources. The Department of Consumer Sciences is the new name at University of California-Davis, and Syracuse's home economics department is named the College for Human Development. Cornell University's home economics department is College of Human Ecology.

Table 4: The Changing Concept of Purpose of Home Economics^a

	"The Beginnings" For Home Use Only 1700-1900	Skills and Techniques "How to Do" 1917	Solution of Family Problems Economic, Social, Political 1940	"Satisfying Personal Development" Early 1950s	"New Directions" Next Decade 1955-1965	"Changing Mission of Home Economics" 1965-1975
Subject Areas	Needlecraft, 1798 Sewing 1820 Cooking 1876 Clothing, Foods 1913	Food & clothing Shelter (housing) Care of sick Care of children Home furnishings Management of resources Social and family relationships	Home living Development of individual Community-home interaction Vocations related to improvement of home life Research – foods, nutrition; funded agricultural experiment stations	Dual role of home economists Family-centered teaching Research-begins to branch out: funds mainly from experiment stations	Education for home, family and community life Professional specialization General-liberal education courses on the increase Interdisciplinary approach to both teaching and research	Emphases on "family service" as an integrative center of home economics Preparation for professionals Undergraduate major; strong generalist Graduate major; specialist Home economics research - all aspects; funds from many sources

^a Adapted from Hoeflin, R. (1970). Careers in home economics. New York: Fairchild Publications. p. 203.

suggests that no unifying name has emerged that describes all the emphases within the discipline and that there is no consistency among home economics colleges, as many include different programs and departments.

Frey (1990) stated that one of the reasons for eliminating the name of Home Economics was that it no longer attracted as many students, and during the 1960s "there was a drop in student enrollment and the degrees granted in home economics did not keep pace

with the total enrollment of women in the nation's colleges" (p. 36). The decrease in women's enrollment in home economics colleges reflected women's changing roles in wage-work, as many no longer saw the relevance of a degree that had such a strong emphasis on home and family. Carver (1979) stated, "The one important improvement cited by most units which have changed their name was that the enrollment of men majoring in the field had increased" (p. 38). A 1973 study by the AHEA, found that 40 percent of the schools surveyed that changed their name showed an increase in the number of men majoring in home economics courses, while only "28 percent of the total group recognized an increase in men majors" (Weis, East & Manning, 1974, p. 15). This did not, however, follow through to all programs, and the majority of textiles and clothing majors continued to be comprised of women.

Gender issues within home economics

For many years, home economics stereotypically was a program just for women, and for this reason, in the 1950s and 1960s, home economics programs came under scrutiny by college administrations. To administrators, the fact that 90 to 100 percent of faculty were women, and that few home economists held doctorates "constituted proof that the field was out of date" (Rossiter, 1997, p. 96). That the majority of the students in home economics were women added to the stereotype. "Only 97 men majored in home economics at the bachelor's degree level in 1947-8. That number doubled to 202 by 1967-8, but men still accounted for less than two percent of the total degrees awarded in home economics" (Rossiter, 1997, p. 99).

In order to combat the issue of female dominance in home economics, the perception

that it was an “out of date field,” and to attract research funds, deans began to hire men, and gave preference to those with doctorates (Rossiter, 1997). According to Baragar (1960), family relations and child development were the areas where the majority of men entered professionally, with design being the next largest group. “Twenty-five years ago a man in home economics was a novelty; fifteen years ago he was accepted; today men are filling faculty positions in competition with women” (Baragar, 1960, p. 833). Although men entered home economics as faculty members and researchers, not as many men were students in home economics.

Changing the focus of the curricula helped to break down the barriers that existed between men and home economics, but incorporating men into home economics was a slow process. In 1962 at University of California, Berkeley, “nutritional sciences” replaced “home economics” in order to attract qualified male faculty and deans. Scholarships or grants open only to males attracted some men to home economics programs. Most men entered home economics through specializations in child development and family relationships, rather than through textiles and clothing related majors. University presidents and male faculty in the home economics program were the main instigators in the change from a woman’s subject by replacing female home economics deans with more traditional male deans. As Rossiter (1997) observed “home economics reverted to the more traditional and comfortable ‘hierarchical segregation’ common in academia, with women clustered in the lower ranks” (p. 116).

At Iowa State, literature reflected the changes that took place. One article, while it promoting the changes in the program, also contained conflicting ideas about the roles of men and women and their career paths.

Recently curricula in textiles and clothing merchandising and in physical education for women have been added; and men are encouraged to enter any of the three majors in institution management: restaurant management, school food service, and college housing and food service. (LeBaron, 1961, p. 8)

In this same article, printed in The Alumnus, only men were mentioned as being in management positions and women were described as the “wife of a top-flight, effective executive...becoming more important than ever before” (LeBaron, 1961, p. 9). This is in opposition to the first half of the article, which stressed the importance of changing the curriculum to meet the needs of women in search of careers.

Home economics colleges have always been stereotypically female. Apparel design within home economics was no different. It has only been in the last few decades that men became more interested in the programs within home economics colleges. In the Home Economics College at Iowa State as a whole, increasing numbers of men joined the college and also the faculty. At Iowa State University in 1960, men accounted for only four percent of all home economics undergraduates. By 1974, that number only rose to six percent. In contrast, the increase in male faculty members was much greater. In 1960 four percent of home economics’ faculty members were male and by 1974, the numbers of male faculty increased to 21 percent (Hilton, 1975).

In the February 1961 issue of The Alumnus, LeBaron stated that there was no longer such a strong emphasis on teaching homemaking skills. She also asserted that although homemaking skills were not stressed as much as they used to be, they were still a necessary part of the curriculum for those who wanted to be teachers in home economics. Even though the article mentioned the new curriculum in textiles and clothing merchandising, it was not added to the list of majors that appealed to male students. This may be partly due to the

necessity to continue to teach homemaking skills in the curriculum and also because of textiles and clothing's early ties to domesticity and femininity.

Attracting men to the program of textiles and clothing became a stated goal in a 1977 program review. Faculty wanted the program to be one that prepared students in the best way possible for careers for both men and women. In the Fall of 1976, all textiles and clothing major students, with the exception of two, were female (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1977). At the beginning of the 1980s an increasing number of men joined the Textiles and Clothing Department, but in comparison to the total number of undergraduates, this number was still very low.

From 1975 on, the language used in the General Catalogs to describe courses and the words used in publications tried to include men. Omitted were terms that inferred housework and homemaking; instead, publications included the word "men" or "male" when referring to majors and courses offered. One example is in the Dean's Letter to the Alumni of the College of Home Economics, as Deacon (1978) explains the increased emphasis the department placed on developing "professional aspects" of the undergraduate program (p. 2). "The objective is to prepare our graduates, both male and female, to compete favorably for positions in textiles and apparel business and industry" (Deacon, p. 2).

Also, the focus on career preparation for professional jobs came to the forefront, which enabled men to feel more comfortable about studying for a career in apparel design or textiles and clothing within a home economics college. Having a male professional designer from New York come to the ISU campus in 1978 to share designing techniques and the process for developing a business promoted the image of textiles and clothing as open to opportunities for men. Interviewee C gave her perspective on men entering the program:

In the 50s, our program was comprised of only women. We had only women students, women faculty. It wasn't until the 70s that we had our first male faculty member. By then we had a few male students and they were brave souls to come into a college that was all female... I think that now the men feel comfortable in the program and I think that the atmosphere of the university has allowed that to happen. (Interview C, November 29, 2000).

Although the department was still dominated by women, the groundwork for bringing more men into the program as students and faculty had already been laid. Men entered the field of home economics slowly as faculty and administrators, but enrollment as students, especially in the textiles and clothing field was even slower.

CHAPTER 3. TEXTILES AND CLOTHING

AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

The evolution of home economics and of the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State University from coursework based on family clothing needs to coursework directed toward professional careers in the apparel industry was a process that took place over a number of years, and continues today. The apparel design program made great progress toward professionalization, and changed in marked ways from 1940 to 1980, but a business and industry focus was still not fully integrated into the program by 1980. This chapter examines the way changes occurred in the history of apparel design education at Iowa State, and focuses specifically on the curriculum. The Iowa State College general catalogs, minutes from design option meetings, and interviews with present and former faculty members provide a good overview of the envisioned outcome of students in the Textiles and Clothing Department and will be used throughout this chapter to discuss change and the slow evolution toward professionalization.

Brief History of Textiles and Clothing at ISU

Iowa State Agricultural College admitted women in 1869, and both young women and men studied agricultural science.³¹ At that time, there were no courses exclusively for women until December 8, 1871 when, as a result of a joint effort by Dr. Adonijah Welch, and his wife, Mary Beamont Welch, the college's Board of Trustees adopted a ladies' course of

³¹ Iowa State is a land grant college that was established by the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1860. This act states a certain amount of public land on which to build and maintain at least one college. The colleges were to be based in agriculture, without excluding other scientific studies (Rose, 1969).

study.³² This course provided a classical education along with training in the practical duties that was intended to serve women in all aspects of life³³ (Conaway, 1936; Eppright & Fergusen, 1971; McMullen, 1926).

Although Iowa State Agricultural College admitted women in the spring of 1869, a course in sewing was not added until ten years later. In 1885, the single sewing course expanded into courses in dress fitting and millinery. When the domestic science department moved into the new Domestic Technology Building in 1894, students used new facilities, which included a cutting and fitting room and sewing and mending room (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). These rooms were “conveniently furnished and equipped for recitations and for demonstration and practice work” (Coburn, 1899, p. 193). In 1895, the department added a new Wheeler Wilson sewing machine (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971).

These new facilities led to the addition of new sewing courses. Plain sewing, dressmaking, and garment work were added to the course list. Pattern drafting was added in 1898. Two terms of plain sewing were required before a student enrolled in two terms of dressmaking (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). Educators designed these sewing courses to help students use commercial patterns and each student developed her own set of samples, which included various stitches, seams, and fastenings (Coburn, 1899).

These courses in the sewing area formed around the ideas and foundations of the

³² Dr. Adonijah Welch was the President of Iowa State College from 1869-1883.

³³ Iowa State was the first of the land-grant colleges to start domestic science courses, but there were other schools before Iowa State that offered the practical teaching of domestic science. Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts, founded in 1837, required female students to participate in domestic duties as a way to teach management. Elmina College, founded in 1855, required its female students to learn household tasks and manage household affairs. Vassar College, founded in 1865, did not have a domestic economy course, but did give lectures upon request on topics of clothing care and kitchen duties (Craig, n.d.).

domestic economy program. Elizabeth Owens, a teacher of home economics at Iowa State College, stated that the aim of the whole home economics course for women provided “knowledge of practical and systematic methods of rendering homes a pleasant and healthful abode” (McMullen, 1926, p. 13). As a result courses in sewing, cooking, foods, general household management, and care of the sick were taught (Iowa State Agricultural College, n.d.). Mrs. Mary Welch not only taught courses on proper living, but also worked to promote the femininity of the arts of domestic economy and to see that her students were leaders in their future households and communities (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). One of her lectures, dated only as 1876, stated:

I hope the future has in store for each one of you a happy home, wherein you may find your highest enjoyment and sacred duties. If, however, Providence has marked out for you some other course, the knowledge you may gain of the wisest methods of house administration will not be lost. (Welch, 1876, p. 1)

Dr. Adonijah Welch conceived of a liberal education for women that would equal men’s and yet encompass practical skills while developing the “intellectual capacities of those who had domestic interests and responsibilities... ‘a scope for scientific progress and research as unlimited and free as that which we offer to the other sex’” (Brown, 1985, vol. 1, p. 191).

In 1902, the drafting and dressmaking courses took students beyond beginning sewing and taught them how to select materials for certain garments. A course in the history of textile manufacturing and weaving was also taught. The second course in drafting and dressmaking revolved around the design and construction of a cotton dress. In addition, students studied millinery, apparel aesthetics, and artistry. In the third course, students made a lined woolen dress and also learned about basketry and historic costume (ISC, 1902).

According to the course catalog of 1912, graduates of the home economics course at Iowa

State University were qualified to fill teaching positions in all grades, not just be homemakers³⁴ (ISC, 1912).

Between 1915 and 1920 the department revised its course offerings. Sewing and dressmaking courses, grouped under the generic term “clothing,” along with courses in costume history and handicrafts were launched. In 1916 the department introduced “budget studies in clothing, planning the wardrobe, and designing garments, replacing the previous emphasis on the manipulative processes in clothing construction courses” (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971, p. 124). Not only was there a new focus in courses taught during 1916 and 1917, but there were also opportunities for students to display their work. Students involved in textiles, clothing, applied design, costume design, and home planning and decoration courses exhibited their best work at the close of the school year. The exhibit committee also brought in other exhibits for display at the college. In 1915 they included, among others, Berea College Handicraft Exhibit, School of Industrial Arts, Philadelphia, Sophia Newcomb College Art Exhibit, and Academy of Fine Arts (ISC, 1916-1917).

Even with the introduction of these new courses and emphases in 1916, the main focus of the Textiles and Clothing Department remained on training “the potential homemaker to provide clothing and household fabrics for her family and her home by purchasing the fabrics and making the articles of furnishing and clothing” (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971, p. 125) and training home economics teachers. Clothing construction was emphasized as beneficial in providing both clothing for the family and fixtures for the home

³⁴ Other positions that graduates held in 1912 mentioned in the course catalog are “dietician work in Hospitals and other institutions, institutional house-keeping, etc. The field of work is unlimited, the demand for college technical women is far greater than can be supplied” (ISC, 1912, p. 134).

before 1924. With the widespread availability of inexpensive ready-to-wear garments, the clothing construction course shifted its emphasis away from construction to the social and economic significance of textiles and clothing. Coursework in clothing construction emphasized the student's ability to build a wardrobe that was pleasing aesthetically and economically (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). The purpose of the Textiles and Clothing Department incorporated this same philosophy. In 1924 the department's emphasis shifted from production of household goods toward consumption of goods. It concentrated on establishing training, knowledge, and research for women as the primary consumer in the family. In this way, she could make informed decisions for the family (ISC, 1924).

One of the stated aims of textiles and clothing in 1929 was to prepare students to teach clothing in secondary schools. This focus was coupled with the previously stated aim of the department, which was to provide training and knowledge to help the consumer make intelligent choices in clothing and household fabrics for the family and home (ISC, 1929). The development of research also came to the forefront as early as 1925, and Iowa State College urged departments to participate in and strengthen their research programs. Graduate students' research helped to develop the depth and breadth of research at Iowa State College (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971).

Seeds of change: 1930-1950

By the beginning of the 1930s, the Textiles and Clothing Department added more design courses, and the curriculum began to focus on training for professional careers. Costume design was taught in the Applied Art Department until Rosalie Rathbone petitioned successfully for its transfer to the Textiles and Clothing Department around 1930

(Eppright & Fergusen, 1971; ISC, 1940). Even before the costume design course moved from the Applied Art Department, the Textiles and Clothing Department offered courses such as Applied Design for Children's Clothing, Applied Dress Design, Advanced Dress Design, and Principles of Pattern Structure (ISC, 1926). These courses provided students the opportunity to apply the principles of design. TC 247a: Costume Design, as described in the 1931 Iowa State Catalog, taught the "application of art principles to the designing and selection of costumes suitable for the individual with emphasis upon line, form, and color," and TC 247b: Costume Design taught the "development of original designs to meet the apparel problems of various types" (ISC, 1931, p. 219). The focus of all of the textiles and clothing courses at this time was on clothing consumption and training home economics teachers. If a student wanted to pursue "commercial work in Textiles and Clothing" (ISC, 1931, p. 218) after graduation, she was advised to take courses in Business Psychology, Advertising Practice, Technical Journalism, and Public Speaking, among others.

In 1932, the Textiles and Clothing Department enlarged its aims for graduates by stating they were qualified to teach clothing not only in secondary schools, but in colleges and extension divisions. The training given by the department also claimed to provide a "background for merchandising and other commercial positions" (ISC, 1932, p. 206).³⁵ Although the specific commercial positions that graduates in textiles and clothing could attain were not mentioned, design was one of the areas in which a student could take courses. This was the first specific mention of design as an area of specialization that the department

³⁵ At this time, the Textiles and Clothing Division offered a Master of Science degree which included courses in history of costume, costume selection, costume design, and children's clothing, among others.

offered (ISC, 1932). Prior to this time, only textiles, textile economics, selection, and clothing construction were offered as areas of specialization.

It wasn't until 1937 that the Iowa State College Textiles and Clothing Department listed types of commercial positions open to graduates. Those positions included work in textiles, clothing, costume design, or fashion. At this time, students could take a number of courses pertaining to costume design: Clothing, Advanced Clothing, Applied Dress Design, two costume design courses: elementary and advanced, and Tailoring (ISC, 1937). Although the Textiles and Clothing Department listed commercial positions in costume design as available for graduates, the courses descriptions at this time provided little indication of an industrial focus.

Evidence that the department began to prepare students for a variety of careers is seen in the 1937-1938 Iowa State Agricultural General Catalogue in the advanced undergraduate courses, but not in the lower level undergraduate courses.³⁶ Advanced work provided “fundamental information and training in textiles and clothing” (ISC, 1937, p. 272). These advanced courses were designed for students interested in pursuing “merchandising or other commercial positions which involve work in textiles, clothing, costume design, or fashion” (ISC, 1937, p. 272). The undergraduate courses remained focused on training students for home economics teaching and training students to be better consumers. They also provided the groundwork for advanced courses and were “essential to the consumer for satisfactorily providing clothing and household fabrics for the individual, the family and the home” (ISC,

³⁶ In the textiles and clothing curriculum, beginning and advanced courses were offered at the undergraduate level. Students who enrolled in the advanced courses had to complete a practical project in clothing construction for no credit. This was discontinued in 1949, and students then took a placement test that determined the appropriate course level (Eppright & Ferguson, 1971).

1940, p. 298).

During this time in the art and design areas of home economics as a whole, which included textiles and clothing, a gradual shift away from education for homemaking toward an emphasis on professional training occurred. While it took time for this shift to occur, both educational trends coexisted as important and valid approaches during the 1940s and 1950s. In keeping with these educational trends, Spafford (1949) believed that the philosophy of home economics revolved around education for home and the family as well as professional education and preparation for employment. He listed many professional career options available to textiles and clothing graduates, including fashion design. Before this time, if women were to become trained in costume design they were urged to take courses at an art school (Dohr & Forbess, 1984).

In the 1940s and 1950s, a shift in education from aesthetics in and for the home to professional training for a career in art and design began to take place. Olive A. Hall (1958) described opportunities available through home economics, although she believed home economics education was not enough background or preparation for a career in apparel design. Hall believed that apparel design education through home economics was an asset to the graduate, but that it alone was not sufficient for a career without additional experience. She thought “few college home economics departments offer an adequate variety of courses for the prospective designer.... [and] successful designers usually serve long apprenticeships and have specialized training in Schools of Design” (Hall, 1958, p. 185). Hall also cited the summary of a 1955 study of 625 clothing and textiles graduates. This study found that 40 percent of those graduates began working in a field that was not related to clothing and textiles. While 61 percent of the graduates found their first employment in the clothing and

textile field, fewer than 10 of those graduates worked as a designer or assistant designer directly out of college (Hall, 1958).

Transitions to professionalism: 1950 to the mid-1980s

In the 1950s and 1960s, the whole curriculum of home economics placed an increased emphasis on preparation for careers, although there continued to be a focus on homemaking. The film, The Story of Home Economics, provides an example of this ongoing dual focus. In the film, four girls entered Iowa State College in the Home Economics Division. As they worked toward graduation, each had to decide which major within home economics was right for her and, ultimately, what career she would choose after graduation. The film focused on areas such as foods and nutrition, education, textiles and clothing, household equipment, child development, applied art, institution management, and journalism. These majors potentially led to careers as tea room managers, dietetics, interior design, buyers for department stores, teaching, and household equipment technicians, and the “career of being Mrs. Johnson” (Iowa State College & Department of Home Economics, 1951, p. 4). The film’s intention was to encourage young women to see the many possibilities that a degree in home economics offered. The fact that one of the four girls in the film chose a career in homemaking showed that there was still a focus on training graduates who wanted to be homemakers, validating homemaking as a career option for graduates.

The continued dualistic role of home economics was particularly evident during this time period. In The Story of Home Economics, filmmakers clearly indicated that although the program prepared students for careers, it also provided for students who wanted to be full time homemakers. At Iowa State, departments began to provide experience in the

professional sector by developing opportunities for students that allowed them to see how their field fit within society (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). These opportunities included internships and study tours. The Iowa State Agricultural College General Catalogue (1953) summed up the curriculum of home economics during the 1950s in this statement: “a college education for women should provide for well-rounded personal development, for preparation to carry the responsibilities of homemaking and citizenship and for a professional career” (p. 131).

Iowa State was not the only program with a dualistic role in education. Many other colleges at this time also taught textiles and clothing with a focus on the home and a focus on educating for careers. This is evidenced in the meetings of the Central Region of the ACPTC. Between 1954 and 1961, conference themes reflected the “two prong focus; on the one hand was the family-centered approach in line with the thinking of the Office of Education and AHEA, and on the other hand, the interest and involvement in merchandising programs and job opportunities” (Dickey, 1990, p. 5).

The Textiles and Clothing Department broadened course offerings and added new opportunities for students to experience the apparel industry. This may have been in response to the greater emphasis placed on preparation for professions that home economics programs pursued during the 1950s and 1960s. The department encouraged students to take part in new courses in merchandising and to participate in field trips, seminars, and study tours designed to widen their perspectives on the clothing industry. Students were also encouraged to use summer vacations to gain work experience (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971).

In the 1950s and 1960s, the Textiles and Clothing faculty at Iowa State worked to develop course offerings to meet objectives for the department. Some of the goals related to

employment of graduates included:

Prepare students for professional careers such as college teaching and executive positions in business....Increase opportunities for student contacts and experiences to enrich their education. Increase the emphasis on the consumption of textiles and clothing rather than the production. (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971, p. 315)

In preparing students for professional careers, the department increased its emphasis on graduate study, introduced a merchandising option, and provided opportunities for students to take field trips to large cities throughout the United States. Although the Textiles and Clothing Department encouraged students to experience the apparel industry, it also chose to continue the focus on consumption of textiles and clothing rather than on the production aspect. This decreasing emphasis on the production area may have negatively impacted the development of the apparel industry focus along with the careers that may have stemmed from this focus.

A 1958 document outlined other objectives of the Textiles and Clothing Department. There was little mention of preparing students for careers in the second document, as priority rested on the family and the individual student. These objectives were:

- I. To help the individual with his social-psychological, managerial and physical needs.
- II. To provide opportunity for aesthetic satisfaction and creative expression in design, construction and use of textiles and clothing.
- III. To further the well-being of the family through textiles and clothing.
- IV. To help students gain insight by examples from the textiles and clothing area into the economic, psychological and sociological phenomena in society. (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1958, p. 1)

Although career preparation was not specifically mentioned in the objectives for the department, there was some evidence that courses contained some degree of professional preparation. One of the objectives for the textiles and clothing majors was the "ability to use art principles personally and professionally" (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1958, p. 1).

This is another example of the conflicting roles that textiles and clothing dealt with at Iowa State, especially during this time of transition.

In 1958, Iowa State College changed its name to Iowa State University of Science and Technology with the stated purpose of increasing prestige and opportunities for the future (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). Home economics became a college in the same year. Dean Helen LeBaron worked hard to keep the home economics program current with the times by encouraging those in home economics to influence public policies and become more involved in international cooperative projects. A major concern of the College of Home Economics was that its graduates become more involved with the welfare of families, and accept responsibility for the community leadership necessary to create an environment favorable to the well being of individuals and families (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). According to Epstein (1958), the core program of home economics gave students a solid base in humanities, social and physical sciences, and helped to develop the individual so she/he could make wise choices.

An increased number of career options became available for graduates in textiles and clothing at this time. In a 1961 publication on careers in home economics, positions available to graduates in textiles and clothing were included in a long, two-page list. Some of the positions listed were: designing in fabrics, garments and accessories; pattern makers, drapers, stylists, fabric buyers; retailing-owner or president of store; buyer; personal shopper; promotion; education; research; communications. According to this publication, apparel design positions were among the highest paid positions within textiles and clothing, but the most difficult to enter and succeed at. To be a good designer, according to the author, a graduate needed knowledge of fabric or textiles, knowledge of clothing construction,

knowledge of art fundamentals, ability to forecast trends, and experience in designing (Tate, 1961). According to Tate (1961), design experience could be gained through designing for self as well as relatives and friends or working part-time in a factory.

In contrast to Tate's (1961) long listing of careers available for textiles and clothing graduates, the Iowa State general catalog listed only these general areas for graduates to find careers: merchandising, textiles, clothing, costume design, and fashion (ISU, 1961). The ISU Textiles and Clothing Department seemed to be more general in the types of careers qualified graduates could fill. The department did offer a course that provided students with the opportunity to learn about career opportunities in the apparel industry, but the department did not emphasize design experience through internships at this time. Even though there was the beginning of teaching clothing for specialized careers in the apparel industry, many of the courses continued to be focused on family and consumer issues.

In 1963 the Textiles and Clothing Department divided into five majors, one being Textiles and Clothing Design. This was intended to lead to a career in apparel design, although it is unclear whether or how many students actually got jobs in design. Dividing the department into majors also became the basis for advanced study (Iowa State University [ISU], 1963). At the same time, the objectives for home economics education in the 1960s focused on professional preparation along with strengthening family life and preparing women for their multiple roles in the world and the family, a continued reflection of the ambiguity of women's roles in society as a whole (Hoeflin, 1970; Hoeflin, et.al., 1981).

In 1972, one of the main goals was to "provide a basic and theoretical framework for a professional specialization directed toward careers in: Business - merchandising and

design...Family serving occupations...Education and research”³⁷ (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1972, p. 2). Thus in 1972, the department’s goals and objectives included preparing students for various careers in apparel businesses and other related occupations. In 1970-1971 some graduates with Bachelor of Science degrees worked in community college teaching, advertising and promotion, merchandising, and non-professional work which included sewing instruction and sales. Most of the students, 31 out of the 39, worked in the merchandising area (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1972).

In a March 1975 statement of the department’s goals, the department wanted to align their curricula with the goals of the Home Economics College. The college continued to be concerned with the “welfare of individuals and families.... focused on such basic needs as food, clothing and housing” (Goals and objectives, 1975, p. 1). The Textiles and Clothing Department planned their area of study accordingly “with a professional education element with emphasis on career preparation and a more general education element, which allows for personal growth as a consumer of textile and apparel products” (Goals and objectives, 1975, p. 1). According to Interviewee C, faculty of the Textiles and Clothing Department, as educators in higher education, did not want to see the curriculum as a vocational training program (November 29, 2000). As a result, textiles and clothing’s dual emphasis on career preparation and general education provided a way to give students a liberal education along with preparing them for careers in industry, and eschewed the perception of being a vocational training program.

Beginning in 1975, evidence suggests that the department worked to develop a

³⁷ Family serving occupations included working in extension, international service, and social service agencies.

stronger apparel design program. In 1975, students participated in field experience aimed at merchandising majors, although there were efforts to develop similar programs for students interested in a career in apparel design, fashion advertising, journalism, and museum curating (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1975). In a 1977 program review, one of the stated goals was to “develop a stronger fashion design option than is presently offered” (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1977, p. 1). Although no explanation of why the fashion design option was considered weaker accompanied the statement, Dr. Farrell-Beck believed several modifications occurred within textiles and clothing between 1976 and 1985 that affected the quality of the program. The ways in which the Textiles and Clothing faculty attempted to address these problems provides insight into the weaknesses of the fashion design option.

One of the changes cited by Farrell-Beck was the transition from courses designed to meet personal needs to courses that prepared students for a career.

For example: clothing selection is geared less to personal wardrobe planning and more to knowledge of how to help others with needs and wants different from one's own to select clothes....many of the courses added in the department likewise have a professional direction. (Farrell-Beck, 1985)

Earlier in the textiles and clothing program, around the 1950s, Interviewee C felt that the focus on home sewing was “perfectly acceptable” and a very important part of the program, (November 29, 2000). According to Interviewee C, some graduates felt that the custom design component would provide them with a vocation to earn money while they were home raising a family. As Dr. Farrell-Beck compared the program from when she started teaching to the mid-1980s, she believed that the textiles and clothing program shifted emphases in later years, and that the new courses added to the program provided an important connection to the apparel industry, moving away from meeting personal needs.

Farrell-Beck also felt that promoting this connection with industry and business was important to developing professionalism within the department. This connection provided “outsider’ perspectives on professional preparation, opportunities for research and consulting activities, moral and physical support for programs” (Farrell-Beck, 1985). One of the last issues addressed by Farrell-Beck was the increased stress on research and graduate education, which helped to strengthen the fashion design option. The number of people involved in research and graduate education along with the quality and quantity of papers and proposals increased from 1976 to 1985 (Farrell-Beck, 1985). Faculty research provided a way to integrate new information gleaned from research into the classroom. According to Interviewee C, one of the roles of faculty was to “provide students with new information and to help them evaluate and understand new information” (November 29, 2000).

In direct reference to the goal of creating a more dynamic design option, a committee formed to evaluate the apparel design option. Discussion revolved around the need for a more focused design emphasis in study tours and paid field experiences for developing a more industry oriented learning environment (Minutes of design option committee, 1977). The committee wrote, reviewed, and mailed letters to firms in order to initiate contacts in the apparel industry as “potential sources of design field experience” (Design group minutes, 1977, p. 1). These letters elicited a large response from firms in the Midwest regarding employment for graduates and work experience for undergraduates (Design committee minutes, 1977). According to the minutes of a design committee meeting, advanced costume design, and draping courses were to take on more industry focus, and shift from personal application (Minutes of design option committee, 1977).

At the same time in the mid-1970s, a lower number of students enrolled in textiles

and clothing. This concerned faculty members as they discussed the implications of the drop in enrollment on the design option³⁸ (Minutes of design option committee, 1977). The unease over the future of apparel design at Iowa State continued into the early 1980s when the textiles and clothing curriculum was under review. Faculty voiced concern that the deletion of apparel design as a prerequisite for production management coursework might lead to the removal of the apparel design component in the textiles and clothing program as a whole as well as decreased career options for graduates (TC curriculum committee minutes, 1984).

In 1981, the design option title changed from “Apparel Design and Patternmaking” to “Apparel Design”³⁹ (Design/selection subject matter group meeting, 1981). The Apparel Design option allowed students to incorporate “industry orientation to apparel design in addition to the continuing home sewing emphasis” (ISU, 1983, p.4). The emphasis on developing professional aspects was intended to prepare graduates to be competitive in the apparel industry job market (ISU, 1983).

The stronger industrial focus in the late 1970s and 1980s may be in part to new faculty members hired by the department who had experience in the industry (Interview A,

³⁸ The decrease in enrollment during the 1970s may be due in part because of the removal of the clothing construction course from the home economics education curriculum, causing a lesser number of home economics education majors to enroll in textiles and clothing courses (Interview A, November 8, 2000). Another possible reason for the decline in enrollment may be that there was a perception that there were few jobs for textiles and clothing graduates (Interview D, December 6, 2000).

³⁹ The change in option title may be due to the lowered number of students enrolled in the pattern-making courses, as it was no longer a required course for merchandising students. The course title change may also be due to the increased emphasis on the production management component. There was even a suggestion in the 1981 CCI meeting to have the curriculum title changed to Apparel Design and Production Management (CCI meeting, 1981).

November 8, 2000; Interview B, November 15, 2000). According to Interviewee B, the new faculty also brought with them an enthusiasm about their experiences in the industry, which rubbed off on other faculty and students (November 15, 2000). These new faculty members brought experience and knowledge, which when coupled with existing faculty working on incorporating new industrial methods led to a stronger apparel industry focus.

One of the ways that existing faculty members incorporated an industrial outlook was by the addition of computer applications in design and construction classes. This was a learning process not only for students but for the faculty as well. Faculty saw the computer's potential for industry and worked to implement programs that would benefit both students and industry (Interview C, November 29, 2000; Interview D, December 6, 2000). In addition to new and existing faculty's expanding knowledge of industrial applications, the Textiles and Clothing Department supplemented existing classroom space with a new clothing construction laboratory and two new design laboratories (Textiles and Clothing Department, New space in MacKay Hall, 1980).

In the Fall of 1986, a pamphlet distributed by Iowa State University included a section on apparel design which focused on the pursuit of a career in the apparel design field. The intention in apparel design courses was now professional preparation intended to qualify students for positions as assistant and head designers, patternmakers, fashion illustrators, custom dressmakers, or stylists (ISU, 1986). The preparation for professional careers was the main focus of the program. There was no mention of apparel design to meet personal needs and goals. This pamphlet revealed the increasing trend toward professional career preparation, emphasizing the slow but eventual transition of textiles and clothing at Iowa State University away from a family and home focus.

The Home Economics College's continued family and consumer focused courses partly reflected the needs of graduates as many became home economics teachers. These teachers in turn were better equipped to teach their students the home sewing skills that were offered at the junior high and high school levels. As women's roles in society and the workplace changed, the Textiles and Clothing Department slowly evolved as well, incorporating more courses that brought an industrial focus to the program. No longer was the focus primarily on preparing women for roles in the home, but it changed, as did home economics, to focusing on preparing women for the professional workplace.

Textiles and clothing at other colleges and universities

Not only was Iowa State moving toward educating a more well-rounded graduate who would be equipped for a career, other colleges around the country also became concerned with providing a textiles and clothing education that met students' needs and wants. The continued issue of teaching family-oriented consumer education versus teaching courses directed toward professional careers in the apparel industry was a major concern in many textiles and clothing programs. This section examines how other textiles and clothing programs dealt with this issue.

After a work conference of college teachers of textiles and clothing from across the United States in 1956, there was a call to critically examine college textiles and clothing departments. These college professors felt that it was necessary to look at what was taught versus what needed to be taught in order to provide an education that allowed students to think independently and to contribute to society. They believed that an education in textiles and clothing should integrate aspects of economics, sociology, and psychology along with

physical, chemical, and biological sciences. In this way it could

help an individual to see the interrelation between one's practices and the cultural environment and provide a medium through which one can understand some of the important economic, social, and political forces operating in a nation and between nations. (Clothing and textiles move forward, 1956, p. 635)

Many other colleges and universities recognized the need to keep current with changes in the world, workplace, and education. Like Iowa State University, they struggled to find a balance in providing for the needs and goals of students, faculty, and eventually, employers. Not all colleges changed in the same way or at the same time as Iowa State University. This section will describe specific changes that took place at other colleges and universities throughout the United States in order to provide deeper insight into and context for the changes at Iowa State University.

Before the 1940s, the art and design areas supplemented home economics education for homemaking (Dohr & Forbess, 1987). By the early 1940s, however, a number of colleges and universities revised their home economics curriculum and attempted to bring more interaction with the apparel industry into the classroom. The following examples from colleges throughout the United States reflected the increasing trend through the 1950s to incorporate an emphasis on training students for professional careers in art and design.

During the 1940s, Carnegie Technical Institute struggled with the dual aim of graduating students that would be intelligent homemakers and also have the background for a professional career. To meet this goal, they devised a way to integrate clothing and design courses by dovetailing similar courses such as the basic clothing course with pattern making and draping. Students worked out a design in the pattern making class, and then executed the designs in the clothing course. Carnegie Tech related their coursework to real life

application. "We were glad to accept the offer from a commercial firm to participate in a project using a zipper as part of the design of a garment and to co-operate with a local department store in carrying it out" (Van Syckle, Myers & Topp, 1948, p. 190).

The University of Illinois used other methods to incorporate the apparel industry processes with coursework. They integrated learning outside the classroom in the development of a new class in fashion analysis. As part of the class, students visited "dress designers, manufacturers, and retailers and follow[ed] the manufacture of a garment from the designer, through the factory, to the retailer" (News Notes, October 1947, p. 542).

The dual focus in many textiles and clothing programs continued into the 1950s, and colleges responded to this duality in different ways. In the late 1950s faculty at Central Michigan College became concerned that their graduates were not being adequately prepared for student teaching. In order to keep the main focus of the program, to train homemakers, yet adequately prepare their students for professional jobs in teaching, the department broadened course content. They moved away from centering on skills, put less emphasis on clothing construction, and attempted to implement a well-rounded basic understanding of the clothing area (Wallace, 1959). This focus on training for home economics educators rather than training graduates for professional jobs in the apparel industry was an issue that pervaded textiles and clothing for years. Training for apparel industry jobs may have been considered leaning too much toward vocational training programs, leading away from a liberal education and home economics' focus on the family. This balance between a liberal education and vocational training was something that many textiles and clothing programs struggled with, Iowa State included.

In the 1970s, educators at The Ohio State University responded to the need to prepare

students for professional careers. They developed a new clothing course that taught the principles of design, construction, and clothing fit. This course allowed the student to choose the module that best fit their career intentions. Students chose from different course modules: altering patterns, fitting apparel for special needs, designing garments, fitting and constructing garments for others, or learning couture design construction techniques (Marshall, 1978).

Not only were new courses being added to textiles and clothing curriculums throughout the United States, but revisions in many departments allowed the creation of apparel design majors or options in the 1940s and 1950s. This reflected the increasing awareness of the importance of art and design as an integral part of home economics programs, rather than as supplemental courses. For example, the University of Vermont revised their curriculum in 1942, so that freshmen took a uniform course of study and then as sophomores, specialized in one of four options, one of which included costume design (News Notes, December 1942). The Oklahoma College for Women created a joint program of study in art and home economics, which allowed students to major in costume design and fashion illustration (News Notes, April 1945). Purdue University and University of Illinois also added an option in costume design in 1946 (News Notes, March 1946; News Notes, November 1946), and ten years later in 1956, Oklahoma A & M College reorganized its department into “two new departments: clothing, textiles, and merchandising; and housing and interior design” (News Notes, February 1956, p. 144).

As curriculums changed, challenges concerning course content and curriculum emphasis arose. Educators faced the challenge of keeping pace with the changing needs of students and the workplace. In the 1950s, there was also a concern that coursework be

broadened to involve aspects of consumer education, although at this time consumer education in general tended to be information for home use rather than for professional development. Syracuse University held three seminars that concentrated on the problems within the textiles and clothing field and on how to incorporate solutions into their educational programs. One of the main debates centered on teaching clothing construction versus teaching consumer skills. Home sewing was not as prevalent as before because of the widespread availability of moderate-priced manufactured garments. About this same time, textiles and clothing programs chose to focus on educating students to be wise consumers who knew how to make good decisions (Baylor & Wybourn, 1950). Some of the discussions at the Third Clothing and Textile Seminar also revolved around adding aspects of consumer education to textile and clothing programs. Consumer education in textiles and clothing involved

a basis for obtaining the premarket information about garments they need for intelligent market selections, ...knowledge of labor's place and problems in clothing production, ...informative labeling, ...and understand[ing] the many possible kinds of services he can obtain from clothing. (Baylor & Wybourn, 1950, p. 804)

Other schools found ways to incorporate more of a consumer education focus in their programs. For example, Indiana State Teachers College held a summer workshop aimed at finding new approaches to "family centered clothing teaching" (Whitesel, 1956, p. 360). This style of teaching revolved around selection of clothing and family clothing budget planning. Approaches suggested included field trips to stores to examine apparel construction and labels and planning wardrobes that worked within a specified budget (Whitesel, 1956). In 1975, Oklahoma State developed a course on evaluating clothing construction principles in ready-to-wear garments, in addition to teaching students basic

clothing construction techniques (Sisler, 1977). This course, although basic, seemed to be based more on professional development rather than for use in the family and home.

On the national level, discussions took place in regards to the purpose and goals of the textiles and clothing programs. In a speech at the national convention of the Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing in 1964, Helen LeBaron suggested a few guidelines for all textiles and clothing programs in the United States. LeBaron believed that in order for the goals of textiles and clothing to reflect the emerging trends in the U.S.⁴⁰ and the pressures on education,⁴¹ textiles and clothing programs needed to provide job preparation that could be adaptable to new opportunities within the field. As she stated: “We must emphasize broad training, versatility, adaptability” (LeBaron, 1964, p. 18). LeBaron (1964) also stated, “The professional preparation that is in our program should be basic enough so that the student can jump in many directions, can adapt readily to new opportunities that will arise in the years ahead” (p. 10). One of the ways that faculty accomplished this at Iowa State was by auditing other faculty members’ courses. In this way, faculty could stay current with issues that were not in their area of specialty. They also took courses in different areas across the campus in order to stay up to date and to “improve their professional competence in teaching,” LeBaron stated (ISU, 1978, p. 16).

Another area of change in the textiles and clothing field was the inclusion of functional design. The program at Cornell University provides an example of how textiles

⁴⁰ LeBaron (1964) mentioned three social and economic trends: “the family is losing its independence,we are entering an era of cybernation, and....we are becoming a world community” (p. 15).

⁴¹ LeBaron (1964) believed that the pressures on education were the increasing knowledge of science and technology, the increasing number of students in colleges, the influence of federal funds for research programs, the rise of technical institutes, and the rise of continuing education.

and clothing incorporated functional design. In the early 1970s, the director of the United States Army's Clothing and Life-Support Equipment Laboratory gave a seminar at Cornell University on the development of military clothing. As a result of this presentation, the faculty at Cornell became more focused on the functional clothing design area. After evaluating their curriculum, faculty added functional problems to existing coursework. In a new course on the theory of functional clothing, one student investigated the process of developing a garment for a blind child, another student developed prototypes for disposable bibs for a daycare center, and another student worked on designing clothing for a person in a wheelchair. Functional design as part of Cornell's curricula led to several jobs for graduates (Watkins, 1974), and also clearly fit with the family related goals of home economics in general.

Clothing and textiles professors recognized the need to continue their education in the United States and abroad. Historically, many professors took advantage of opportunities to study fashion in other countries. Faculty members spent time overseas studying various phases of the apparel industry in relation to the American clothing industry (Myers & Brandau, 1949) and fashion design centers, and visited various textile mills and research institutes (News Notes, November 1950). Interviewee A, of Iowa State, took advantage of a faculty leave of absence to visit apparel industries in California and North Carolina. From her point of view, she felt that as an educator, her role was to be "continually updating our knowledge and testing ourselves and learning what is going on in the industry" (Interview A, November 8, 2000). She viewed continuing education critical for an educator since learning was a life long activity. By actively pursuing this goal, faculty showed students that education does not stop upon graduation.

The changes at these schools demonstrate the larger context of the changes at Iowa State University. Many programs at separate schools responded to the changing goals of women especially as they related to professionalization and increased interest in apparel design as a career. The changes also reflect the continued issues that textiles and clothing programs struggled with such as vocational versus liberal education and the emphasis on training students to be better consumers and training home economics teachers, rather than focusing on training students for careers in the apparel industry. There were many aspects of the curriculum at Iowa State University that facilitated the transition from a single, basic sewing course to a specific option in apparel design intended to teach students to be designers in the apparel industry. The specifics of these changes in coursework and internships and how they affected the transition toward professionalization will now be investigated.

Evolution of Professionalization of Apparel Design at ISU

At Iowa State, home economics underwent significant changes in curriculum content and focus throughout its history. One of the areas that challenged the traditional core of Home Economics or Family and Consumer Studies was clothing and textiles, particularly in the area of apparel design and the sewing and design courses. Changes in the department took place, but with time and effort, and not without differences of opinion. The following section examines changes in the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State and how they related to the evolution of coursework toward career preparation for graduates. The section relies on course catalogs, minutes from meetings, unpublished documents from the department, and interviews with textiles and clothing faculty members for information. It is

easy to look at the time frame involved in these changes, but much more difficult to analyze the effort or to know how arguments for or against change evolved. Unfortunately, written words only display a tiny fraction of the amount of energy, discussion, and attention devoted to making these changes happen in the department.

Coursework

There are two main areas on which this section focuses, both of which contribute to the understanding of the way the Textiles and Clothing Department changed. The first area discusses the changes that took place in individual courses and in the curriculum as a whole. The second area examines how internships and study tours became more important in the Textiles and Clothing Department for graduates preparing for a professional career in the apparel industry. These topics provide an insider's perspective to the actual ways that Iowa State University changed its programs as it moved from an emphasis on home sewing, to a dual emphasis on home sewing and apparel careers outside the home, and ultimately to a near sole emphasis on career preparation.

Changes in course content reflected some of the changing goals and objectives of the department and made it possible to analyze how the integration of industry and professional preparation in the students' education took place. As the department placed more emphasis on job preparation, the courses developed an industry focus and gradually moved away from an emphasis on home and family. This section describes some of the major changes in coursework in the Textiles and Clothing Department. It cannot, however, reflect the interactions that actually occurred in the classroom and so provides an incomplete picture.

In the 1940s, the department offered "courses designed to furnish such knowledge

and training as is essential to the consumer for satisfactorily providing clothing and household fabrics for the individual, the family and the home” (ISC, 1940, p. 298). In the 1940-41 Iowa State College General Catalogue, the Textiles and Clothing Department mainly focused on developing skills to become better consumers. Another focus of the program was to train home economics teachers. These teachers would then train students to be better clothing consumers. This followed the national trend in most traditional home economics programs which taught clothing construction that revolved around “custom production of garments for family members, particularly females” (Heisey, 1984, p. 12) until the 1960s and 1970s. At this time, teaching revolved around designing and producing clothes for the family as well as proper selection and care of ready-to-wear clothing. During this time, more women found careers outside the home, but many students in textiles and clothing used these courses in custom design as a way to earn an income while raising their families (Interview C, November 29, 2000).

At Iowa State, the description for TC 144: Costume Design followed this trend and focused on “essentials of designing and selection of costumes for types and individuals” (ISC, 1940, p. 299).⁴² The main focus of TC 224: Clothing was the design and construction of a dress suitable for developing individual sewing skills. In the 1943 general catalog, another class was added, TC 104: General Textiles, but once again, it focused on fabrics and textiles related to the home (ISC, 1943). At this time, there was little, if any, training for positions in the apparel industry. It was only through completing advanced work that a graduate would be better prepared for a commercial position in merchandising, clothing,

⁴² The 100 level courses are usually designed for freshman level students. Seniors take upper level courses, designated by a higher number such as 300 or 400.

textiles, fashion or costume design. Otherwise, the orientation of the beginning courses was geared toward home sewing, teaching sewing, and selection of clothing.

Although most courses stayed the same during World War II, the war years did provide new teaching challenges everywhere, and many colleges added courses related to conservation efforts. For example, Cornell University's clothing courses focused on the problems of rationing and conserving material and clothes. They stressed the importance of reusing materials in creative and inventive ways. The students at Cornell devised a way to provide practice in custom dressmaking by remodeling customers' garments (Stocks, 1969). The draping course at Iowa State also turned to clothing conservation during World War II. Course instruction revolved around construction problems in remaking and restyling outdated garments (News Notes, May 1943).

Within the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State, faculty became concerned that students did not receive a clothing construction education that pertained to their individual skill level. This reflected the concern of many faculty in other colleges for an improved textiles and clothing curriculum. They recognized rapid changes in society and the "need for reappraisal and revision of curricula to cope with these changes" (Peters, 1973). The 1949, 1952, and 1952 meetings of ACPTC discussed curriculum content, development of tests, and the improvement of teaching. They even discussed whether clothing construction courses should be included in the curriculum (Dickey, 1990). This was another example of the continued discussion about the vocational nature of clothing construction and its place in a university curriculum.

In order to combat this, beginning in 1945 textiles and clothing students at Iowa State took a placement test that covered sewing, construction, and flat pattern in order to determine

the level of previous instruction prior to enrollment in clothing construction courses.⁴³

Students were then placed in one of three courses that pertained to their level of knowledge in clothing construction. An experimental course, introduced in spring 1959, replaced the elementary clothing construction course.⁴⁴ This new course combined flat pattern design and clothing construction in order to provide students with a course that progressed rapidly and motivated students to do more creative work, while providing them with necessary skills. In 1960, advanced students took an additional credit that “made it possible to assign pattern problems for out-of-class practice and for learning experiences which combined pattern-making and basic sewing techniques” (Hall & Hollen, 1961, p. 774).

Although faculty revised some courses to meet students’ needs, course content continued to slowly evolve to meet women’s new and changing roles in the workforce during the 1950s and 1960s. According to LeBaron (1975) the homemaking core was emphasized through the 1950s with “professional preparation built on top of it” (p. 3). The continued emphasis on a general education rather than a specialization may be one of the reasons that textiles and clothing was slow to develop a professional focus. Another reason for the slow changes may be the different ways that faculty and students viewed the goals of the program. According to Interviewee C, in the mid-1950s, the textiles and clothing faculty at Iowa State “considered the program to have a career orientation, but I think that the students, who were

⁴³Pretests of this nature were also studied at Oklahoma State University. Purdue University used pretests to determine the level of student’s ability in order to divide an introductory clothing course into beginning and advanced groups. Southern Illinois University also administered a test, which covered all of the subjects to be taught in the beginning clothing course. New Mexico State University’s pretest tried to determine a student’s strengths and weaknesses. South Dakota State College used a pretest to study the kind and level of sewing experience (Semeniuk & Galbraith, 1964).

⁴⁴ The textiles and clothing curriculum incorporated this experimental course into its permanent course offerings in 1961.

mostly women thought of it as primarily homemaking” (November, 29, 2000). Interviewee D mentioned that when she started teaching at Iowa State in 1977, the job market was still in teaching (December 6, 2000). This may partly explain why the focus of textiles and clothing courses in the 1950s remained centered on the family, as home economics teachers in turn taught their students similar family-centered courses. This link between home economics education and family centered courses may have hindered and slowed the development of courses aimed at preparing students for careers in the apparel industry.

As the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State University moved toward professionalization, it lagged behind textile science schools, as did many land-grant colleges. The focus of education at textile science schools and at land-grant colleges was different in nature. In one study, Frey (1990) compared the textiles and clothing programs of land-grant colleges and textile science schools between 1950 and 1980. She found that textile schools offered apparel design courses that incorporated an industrial focus while land-grant schools maintained a home economics focus. The home economics focus meant that textiles and clothing was still taught as a subject within the context of the home economics philosophy between 1950 and 1980. According to Frey (1990), home economics programs’ predilection toward teaching apparel design for home sewing and consumers often led to a limited focus on jobs and careers in the industry.

Even though Iowa State seemed slow in developing a focus on careers for the apparel industry, the majority of courses met student’s needs. According to Interviewee C (November 29, 2000), textiles and clothing students in the 1950s could take a practicum in custom design, in which students worked to design clothing for a community member. Students in the course described it as helpful if they needed to earn extra money after

graduation while they were home starting a family. As a result, home sewing at that time was a very practical course (Interview C, November 29, 2000). In a 1957 study of all home economics graduates, 57 percent of those who used their professional training reported that it was “very helpful and adequate” while 40 percent felt that it was “helpful but not adequate” (Lyle, 1957, pp. 11-12). Although those figures were for the Home Economics College as a whole, it showed that a great number of graduates felt that they did not have enough education or expertise to compete favorably in the workforce. The study also confirmed the need for a broader preparation for careers. In opposition to Lyle’s survey, the majority of respondents from another Iowa State Home Economics’ survey found that graduates felt courses better prepared them for professions than for marriage⁴⁵ (Eppright & Ferguson, 1971).

In the 1960s there was an increased emphasis placed on training for commercial jobs in the apparel industry, although training for home economics teachers remained a major part of the program. As described in the 1959-1961 Iowa State University General Catalogue, the main focus of the Textiles and Clothing Department revolved around providing information essential to graduates pursuing commercial jobs. This is the first time that the catalog mentioned preparation for commercial jobs⁴⁶ as the main purpose, rather than a secondary result of education in each area of specialization. The Textiles and Clothing Department worked to prepare students for jobs in the apparel industry and for retail and teaching

⁴⁵ Those surveyed graduated from the Department of Home Economics at Iowa State between 1933 and 1953 (Eppright & Ferguson, 1971).

⁴⁶ The word “commercial” in this context refers to jobs or work intended for profit. In the ISU Catalog from 1961-1963, “commercial positions” for students majoring in clothing included “teaching in stores, extension or trade schools, custom dressmaking, work with commercial companies as consultant, sample maker, or educational director” (Iowa State University, 1961, p. 359).

positions, along with providing courses in a liberal education. Although TC 204: Textiles and TC 145: Costume Selection still maintained a focus on clothing, the environment, and the household, courses such as TC 401: Senior Study Tour and TC 465: Professional Opportunities in Textiles and Clothing offered introductions to the apparel industry. TC 401 was a tour to visit the apparel industry, and TC 465 allowed students to analyze “opportunities open to women” (ISU, 1959, p. 254) in the industry while studying textiles mills and clothing factories.

There was more emphasis on providing students with career information in the 1961-1963 catalog. TC 123: Patternmaking and Clothing Construction used basic commercial patterns and also introduced students to pattern designing. Although TC 145: Costume Selection still emphasized finding clothing appropriate for individuals, it also added social, economic, and design factors to broaden the scope of the class. This class is an example of one of the ways that faculty worked to meet student’s changing needs. According to Interviewee C, faculty recognized that there was a difference between students in the 1950s and students in the 1960s. They tailored the clothing selection course to meet the changing needs of those students in the 1960s by adding social-psychological aspects of clothing. Discussion in the course revolved around the expression and evaluation of clothing in different cultures and different age groups. As Interviewee C stated, “Life [was] changing...and we can’t be teaching these things that we had taught on the basis of what was popular in the 50s to those who were in the 60s” (November 29, 2000).

The children’s clothing course, TC 326, evolved in the early 1960s to involve selection, designing, and construction of clothing in relation to a child’s development and the evaluation of ready-to-wear. Other courses were added in the early 1960s: Intermediate and

Advanced Textiles, Advanced Patternmaking and Clothing Construction, and Costume Design and Selection (ISU, 1961). These new courses paved the way to separating the Textiles and Clothing Department into specific majors by adding a wider variety of courses with a narrower focus. It also demonstrated the department's movement toward a greater emphasis on courses that led toward careers in the apparel industry, although some courses continued to retain their family oriented focus.

In 1963, Textiles and Clothing Design was one of five majors introduced within the Textiles and Clothing Department. It was "planned for students interested in apparel designing" (ISU, 1963, p. 359). This was the first mention of a specific major in apparel design, although students could specialize in apparel design prior to 1963. TC 365: Professional Opportunities in Textiles and Clothing broadened to incorporate "individual investigation of specific jobs" in the apparel design field, along with studying various career opportunities "related to...job opportunities in merchandising, promotion, public relations, consumer service, research and textile testing" (ISU, 1963, p. 360). TC 464: Family Clothing Consumption provided information on the "production and distribution of textile and clothing products for the consumer market" (ISU, 1965, p. 383). This class added supplemental information on another aspect of the apparel industry. The intent of these courses combined to better prepare students for professional, lifelong wage-earning jobs, and yet the focus could still fulfill the family oriented home economics mission.

In 1969, the Textiles and Clothing Department decreased the number of majors from five to two: Textiles and Clothing, and Textiles and Clothing and Related Sciences. Within each major, there were two options. The Textiles and Clothing major contained two options: Design and Merchandising. Physical Science and Social Science were the two options

available within Textiles and Clothing and Related Sciences (ISU, 1969).

When the department introduced options within majors, they also expanded the breadth of course offerings with the addition of new courses. TC 429: Custom Tailoring and TC 465: Introduction to Sociological and Psychological Aspects of Clothing and Textiles were added in 1969. TC 210: Sophomore Seminar, added in 1969, gave not only an orientation to the textiles and clothing field, it also provided an introduction to “professional opportunities” (ISU, 1969, p. 473). As career preparation became more important, courses began to be geared toward that preparation much earlier in a student’s program of study than in previous years. In 1971, the addition of TC 470: Supervised Experience enabled students to take part in “supervised work experience in a cooperating retail or manufacturing firm, design studio, or museum” (ISU, 1971, p. 491). This internship course provided another step in career preparation. This class was much more hands-on, as students worked and gained on-the-job experience in apparel industries (ISU, 1971). These new courses offered students key opportunities to make themselves more employable in the industry.

Although the increasing trend was toward career preparation, not all classes contained that focus. According to Interviewee A, the tailoring course focused on “using home sewing methods for women’s tailoring” (November 8, 2000). Interviewee A also mentioned that the focus of the clothing construction course continued to involve home sewing machines, home sewing methods, and commercial patterns. Clothing selection also continued to focus on individual clothing selection (November 8, 2000).

Even though the department continued to move away from the focus on home, students graduating in the mid-1970s were not prepared for the industry and “were not comfortable with the skills that they had” (Interview D, December 6, 2000). According to

Interviewee D, the reasons may have been linked to the lack of readily available design jobs, the lack of the department's industry connections, and that the textiles and clothing program "was looked upon as a home economics program rather than an industry training program" (December 6, 2000). These issues pertaining to industry preparedness became topics of discussions in Design Option meetings and Clothing Construction Instruction meetings in the late 1970s and 1980s.

Preparing students for careers in the apparel industry started to become a focus in the late 1960s, and took precedence in the late 1970s and 1980s. Prior to this time, most textiles and clothing graduates who worked outside the home were teachers or worked in retail. Very few graduates became designers (Interview D, December 6, 2000). The 1983 Century Update stated, "During the 1970s, students have had a growing interest in professional preparation" (ISU, 1983, p. 4). The students' increased interest in career preparation caused the Textiles and Clothing Department to expand "to include an industry orientation to apparel design in addition to the continuing home sewing emphasis" (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1983, p. 4). Interviewees A, C, and D stated that even though coursework in the 1970s still used home sewing techniques, the courses also featured career preparation. At this time, the department still did not have industrial sewing machines and continued to teach courses using home sewing machines (Interview A, November 8, 2000; Interview C, November 29, 2000; Interview D, December 6, 2000).

In 1973, TC 122: Introduction to Patternmaking taught "basic pattern making techniques as they are used by commercial pattern companies and apparel manufacturers.... [and] pattern designing, pattern alteration and fitting of garments" (ISU, 1973, p. 287). This gave students a much earlier start on learning more about the techniques used in the apparel

industry. TC 430: Custom Dressmaking provided students more information about one narrow business type in the apparel industry. The class revolved around “designing, making patterns and sewing for a selected clientele-a business approach to sewing” (ISU, 1973, p. 288). “Designing for a selected clientele” suggests that this course was not geared toward students interested in careers in the mass market apparel design, but geared more toward students who wanted to develop their own custom design business.⁴⁷

In the 1969-1971 Iowa State University General Catalogue, the Textiles and Clothing Department’s stated purpose was to prepare its majors “for many different kinds of positions” and to provide “a basis for advanced study” (ISU, 1969, p. 473). By 1975, goals for the Textiles and Clothing Department revolved around professional education and career preparation in the knowledge of textile and apparel products and processes, along with personal development. Professors wanted graduates to be well equipped to translate consumer needs and wants into technical terminology appropriate for manufacturing firms (Goals and objectives, 1975). The addition of courses in math, computer science, and business helped to accomplish these goals (ISU, 1983). According to Textile and Clothing professor, Dr. Jane Farrell-Beck, “one of my most vivid impressions of the past nine years (my term of service in the college) is one of ever increasing attention to career preparation. Few vestiges remain of courses that met primarily personal needs” (Farrell-Beck, 1985).

By 1975, other elements combined to add depth to the existing program. A new

⁴⁷ In a 1981 Clothing Construction Instruction meeting, part of the discussion revolved around ways to improve the apparel design curriculum. One of the improvements cited was to remove Custom Dressmaking from the curriculum or split it into two courses (CCI meeting, 1981). In the 1981-1983 course catalog, Custom Dressmaking was not part of the curriculum, instead Intermediate Fashion Design incorporated teaching both custom and ready-to-wear construction techniques (ISU, 1981) as part of a mass production course from the designer’s viewpoint (CCI meeting, 1981).

course, TC 165: Clothing in Contemporary Society, taught the significance and structure of the apparel and fashion industry with “analysis of how the contemporary apparel market meets the diverse clothing needs within our society” (ISU, 1975, p. 283). TC 245: Clothing Selection was reconfigured to include the study of both couture and ready-to-wear designers, whereas in the past, the focus was on the selection of clothing to fit various needs. TC 345: Costume Design included a component to analyze trends and designers of the time, and in TC 165: Clothing in Contemporary Society students studied the “structure and nature of the fashion and apparel industry,” and analyzed “how the contemporary apparel market meets the diverse clothing needs within our society” (ISU, 1975, p. 283). These courses brought global awareness along with analysis of contemporary trends to the program. They also partially reflected the goals of the department in March 1975 to develop creativity, to enhance personal lives, and to serve as a basis for design related careers (Goals and objectives, 1975). These goals evidenced the continued dual focus in textiles and clothing education.

Even with this dual focus, there was an increased attention to career preparation. An example of this was demonstrated in a 1976 meeting of the Clothing Construction Instruction Group. During the meeting, faculty discussed ways in which clothing construction could be more professional in content moving away from a personal orientation (Minutes of CCI meeting, 1976). In the Dean’s Letter to the Alumni, Ruth Deacon (1978) mentioned that as part of increasing preparation for careers, the design program invited Charles Kleibacker to campus for a seminar on couture design techniques and developing a business. This introduced students to new and different aspects of the apparel design industry and provided the opportunity to interact with a successful designer.

In the late 1970s and 1980s the university moved from a quarter-based system to a semester-based system. During this time of transition, faculty and staff examined each course to determine objectives and outcomes and to eliminate overlap between courses. This preparation for the incorporation of the semester system was one of the reasons many changes that took place in the late 1970s and 1980s. According to Interviewee C, this time of transition allowed faculty to analyze courses thoroughly.

We took it seriously and did it well, I think. We looked at the whole [curriculum] to see if we were building on knowledge, or if we were just repeating things....We set down what objectives were needed for the courses and at what levels did they perform what we expected. (Interview C, November 29, 2000)

These curriculum meetings also involved a great deal of discussion within the department that revolved around the concept of option versus major. Faculty who opposed having options rather than straightforward majors did so because they felt that the “option” did not have clear or definite career implications. They felt that companies would look more closely at the major instead of looking at transcripts to see what courses students completed (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1977). This demonstrates the department’s concern with the ability of students to compete for industry positions, but also shows the conflict that revolved around the best approach for gaining that career focus.

The discussion about career implications of textiles and clothing curricula was not localized. Iowa State reflected the movement that was happening nationally. According to McGrath (September 1968), home economics as a whole needed to decide whether the field should be made of “a common core of general education and a common core of professional education” or to be a “collection of disparate specializations with little in common and clustered around the rather nebulous concept of ‘home and family life’” (p. 508). Although

McGrath (September 1968) suggested that curricula should devote the most time to general home economics instruction because almost half of all home economics graduates went into teaching, Horn (1986) observed that there was an increase in the number of undergraduate majors in specializations showing the move away from the preparation of secondary teachers. In the 1970s, general home economics experienced a drastic decrease in the number of its majors while the number of students in specializations increased (Horn, 1986).

At Iowa State, merchandising became a large component of the Textiles and Clothing Department, and many of the course offerings focused on apparel merchandising.⁴⁸ Students in merchandising and also in apparel design took more courses in science, business, and computer fields so that they would be better able to compete for positions in the industry after graduation. Merchandising, and later apparel production, helped bridge the gap between sewing, design, and the final product in retail stores. Faculty studied the apparel manufacturing process and identified a gap in the program. As a result of their investigation, coursework was added that allowed students to learn how their designs became products in a store (Interview D, December 6, 2000). These new courses also provided another career option for students interested in merchandising and production.

The 1980s through today continued the trend toward a more industrial outlook and an emphasis on job preparation. Interviewee B summed up the changes that took place by saying, “content and increased positive image developed gradually. This reflected stronger career orientation, but also included an intellectual, analytical, problem-solving emphasis”

⁴⁸ For example, in 1972 60 percent of Textiles and Clothing students chose the Merchandising Option, while only 18 percent chose the Design Option, with two percent choosing both options (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1972).

(Interview B, November 15, 2000).

The movement toward a stronger industrial focus was slow to develop, but according to Interviewee C, was a reason the textiles and clothing program expanded. Faculty's liaisons with businesses in the apparel industry provided students with additional resources for learning, internships, and field trips. According to Interviewee C, faculty began to build alliances with the apparel industry by using the week after commencement to examine Iowa's apparel industry. These alliances within the state of Iowa provided students with internships and other learning opportunities in the apparel industry (November 29, 2000). It was through the examination of the apparel industry through these connections that faculty became aware "how far our program was askew" and that "our students were not prepared for today's world" (Interview D, December 6, 2000). This led to the development of a series of videotapes on production for use in the classroom and the revision of some courses toward a mass production viewpoint (Interview D, December 6, 2000).

Not all faculty at Iowa State believed that the formation of alliances with business and industry were good for the program, and were concerned that it made the program sound more like a vocational training program. "People in higher education are more geared to concepts, ideas, and philosophies. To turn that corner to saying that we can make a contribution to industry was slow and sometimes painful" (Interview C, November 29, 2000). They were afraid that their research, when funded by business or industry, would be skewed toward a favorable result for the company. "Gradually the university came to say that we, as a land-grant institution, are required to provide information for the welfare of the state. As the university began to loosen up on that, it became easier to become industry-oriented" (Interview C, November 29, 2000). Some faculty was also concerned that a strong

alliance with the industry would allow industry to have too much control over the direction of the textiles and clothing program (Interviewee C, November 29, 2000). Despite some opposition to the increased ties with the industry, the Textiles and Clothing Department continued to promote these alliances.

Faculty, interested in involving industry and business with the department's curriculum, garnered not only educational opportunities, but also financial contributions and equipment donations. In the spring of 1980, Kinney Shoe Corporation gave a large amount of money to Iowa State's Textiles and Clothing Department, while Dodger Manufacturing Company and DeLong's Sportswear, Inc. donated used industrial sewing machines to upgrade the apparel labs and increase the apparel industry focus of the department (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1981).

The stronger industrial outlook was one of the topics discussed at a Design/Selection Subject Matter Meeting in 1981. Faculty discussed the inclusion of additional computer science courses to strengthen the industrial focus (Design/selection subject matter group meeting, 1981). The issue they encountered was that few computer science courses were available for non-majors; although this was not the first time that faculty encountered problems in adding a stronger industrial focus to the curriculum. In a 1977 Design Option meeting, faculty members pointed out the need for students to learn industry-type pattern grading and the necessity for adding sewing machines and equipment⁴⁹ (Minutes of design

⁴⁹ In December 1980, Intermediate Fashion Design involved the instruction of the use of several industrial machines including a Singer locksmith machine, Merrow serger, and Point Turner. Students also learned to use smaller industrial tools like pattern hooks, pattern punches, pattern notchers, industrial tracing wheel and hammer and punch set to aid in the making of slopers (Textiles and Clothing Department, Industrial applications, 1980).

option committee, 1977).

In the 1984 Annual Report, there is mention of the development of a “computer package to assess construction quality of ready-to-wear clothing to create apparel pattern design” (Annual report, p. 13). This new equipment’s purpose was further developed in the 1986 Textiles and Clothing Department’s mission statement. One of the department’s stated purposes was to prepare “students for a range of careers in textiles and apparel in business, industry, public and private agencies, and education” (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1986, n.p.). As a result of the focused mission and redesigned courses with a focus on career development, students graduating in apparel design were well prepared with the technical skills necessary for jobs in the apparel industry after graduation. As stated in the College Program Review (1984), “the number of majors [in textiles and clothing] has been slowly increasing” (Textiles and Clothing Department, p. 2) after the program shifted from focusing on home sewing to designing for the ready-to-wear industry.

Not only did more students enter the textiles and clothing program, but faculty increased the image of the program by writing nationally known textbooks and producing teaching videos. According to Interviewee C, as early as the 1950s, faculty wrote the primary textiles and clothing books used in many college curricula. Later, as education moved into a “self-motivated education” era, faculty produced video packages and study materials that were marketed nationally. As the program expanded into merchandising, quality control, and production, faculty wrote more textbooks. “There were times when we had 7 or 8 textbooks coming out of this department” (Interview C, November 29, 2000). In addition to writing textbooks, faculty also recognized the need for change in the home economics core.

In 1983 the home economics core came under consideration. According to Interviewee B there was some criticism against the home economics concentration and home economics core curriculum (November 15, 2000). Students questioned the pertinence of the core, and faculty felt the need to explain why it was necessary. In a 1983 TC Curriculum Meeting, faculty discussed the possibility of the home economics core perpetuating “the perception of home economics majors as fitting the ‘homebody’ stereotype” (n.p.). In order to combat the negative criticism of the core curriculum, textiles and clothing faculty wanted to work “on greater integration of our courses with offerings in the rest of the college” (TC curriculum meeting, excerpts from minutes 1982-1983, 1983, n.p.), along with working on a balance between general education and professional courses (TC curriculum meeting, excerpts from minutes 1982-1983, 1983).

According to Interviewee A, coursework in textiles and clothing changed from using mainly home sewing techniques to industrial methods in the 1980s and 1990s (Interview A, November 8, 2000). Computer application methods were also incorporated during this time, solidifying the change away from home sewing methods. Students not only received a general education that could benefit them in any chosen career, but by the 1990s, courses in textiles and clothing emphasized industrial methods which could be translated into specific job skills in apparel design. This was a change from the 1940s when most graduates in textiles and clothing became teachers or extension agents or did not use their degree in the job market. Apparel design students in the 1980s and 1990s at Iowa State learned skills that could potentially lead to specific careers in the apparel design field.

These changes in coursework did not take place without reason, without discussion, or even without controversy. However, the developments reflect the faculty’s attention to

adapting the curriculum to meet the changing career goals of women. The sum total of the changes in coursework evidences the continual march toward professionalization in Textiles and Clothing at Iowa State University. The apparel design program at Iowa State University underwent significant transformation in the last half of the twentieth century. Changes in women's employment, women's education, and curriculum changes within Home Economics affected decisions made in the apparel design program.

In the 1940s and 1950s, the beginnings of a shift in teaching art for a career rather than the home took place. Schools began to add more courses in apparel design, and many schools added a specific apparel design major or option. In comparison, Iowa State University did not add a major in apparel design until 1963, and their courses revolved around teaching skills needed in the home and preparing home economics teachers. The 1950s and 1960s focused on the dual role of personal development and professional development. This time seemed to be a time of transition for many schools as they worked on incorporating a greater emphasis on careers within home economics' curricula. During the 1950s and 1960s there was an emphasis on consumer education and many other schools highlighted the importance of teaching consumer skills.

Although Iowa State University, along with other colleges, began to emphasize consumer education in the 1920s and 1930s, the emphasis greatly increased during these decades. In the 1960s, the addition of courses at Iowa State University with a focus on the apparel industry reflected the goal of preparing women for multiple roles in the workforce, society, and family. This continued into the 1970s as the Textiles and Clothing Department emphasized career preparation, while keeping a home sewing component. A more focused apparel design major also developed during the 1970s at Iowa State University, but by 1989,

the transition to professionalization in the apparel design area was still evolving. The movement toward professionalization not only included coursework, but internships and study tours played a large part in preparing students for careers in apparel design.

Internships and study tours

In addition to the courses and curricular changes outlined above, the incorporation of industry preparation into the curriculum in the Iowa State University Textiles and Clothing Department took two different forms: internships and study tours, along with coursework as outlined above. This section will examine both. Although the focus is on Iowa State University, to provide context, examples from other schools will be used as a comparison, when appropriate.

Internships, or field experience,⁵⁰ grew out of a need to offer students on-the-job training to gain first hand experience of work in the industry. Educators in colleges and universities around the country used these training programs as ways to forge alliances and to build contacts within the clothing industry. Educators felt that internships were a good way for graduates to gain entry into the clothing industry, and to enter into a position at a higher level (Wright, 1949). The real-life work experience and the chance to work with knowledgeable people in the industry gave students an employment advantage after graduation. Not only would they have a degree, but they would also have experience and training that could set them apart from others applying for the same job. Internships also

⁵⁰ Field experience as it is used here “refers to those situations in which students are given an opportunity to make practical application of their professional education in agencies and institutions outside of the university and for which they receive university credit” (Field experience programs, 1977, n.p.). The term field experience can also be interchanged with internship, apprenticeship, or practicum.

potentially helped a student to build self-confidence, confirmed career goals, and provided an opportunity to develop a portfolio from internship projects (Manis, 1980).

At Iowa State University, the Textiles and Clothing Department incorporated internships into their curriculum to show students the relationship between their education and their work in the industry, with the intention of “assist[ing] students to develop work related attitudes, to clarify and expand career goals, to integrate academic preparation with practical application, and to heighten the meaning of previous and prior class work” (Field experience programs, 1977, n.p.). Although the department and its students benefited from internships, industry also gained through students’ work experience. Industry often used internships as a way to acquire fresh, new ideas from students, reduce labor costs, and attract trained workers coming back to look for jobs after graduation.

The Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State University encouraged students to take part in supervised work experience through summer work programs or through part time employment during the course of an academic year in the 1950s and 1960s. But the internship course, or TC 470: Supervised Experience, was not added to the course list until 1971. In order to qualify for obtaining class credit for an internship in apparel design, students had to be of junior or senior standing and obtain recommendation from the department. Internships included the areas of Historic Textiles and Clothing, Apparel Design and Manufacture, and Merchandising (ISU, 1971). In most cases, it was the student’s responsibility to find work experiences that would enhance the meaning of their academic specialization (Field experience programs, 1977).

In a 1975 report, the Textiles and Clothing Department faculty expressed concern that the curriculum needed to keep current with trends and issues in the clothing industry and

in higher education. As a result, the faculty and staff wanted to continue to maintain a good association with business and industry. “This relationship is critical for giving the kind of insight needed to maintain an academic program which provides graduates with the strongest preparation to compete in the present and future job markets” (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1975, p. 40). At the time of the report, most of the internships were in the merchandising field, although there was a goal to further the development of better internship programs for those students interested in apparel design. In 1972, 60 percent of textiles and clothing majors were in the merchandising option, as compared to only 18 percent in the design option⁵¹ (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1972). There were still a larger number of merchandising students than design students in 1977 (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1977), which may account for the priority given to the development of merchandising internships over design internships. Design internships were also harder to locate and didn’t have the structure typical of merchandising internships. These may be additional reasons why there were fewer students with design internships.

Creating and maintaining quality internships was something that the faculty worked on for a number of years. The subject of creating more paid internships in well-established and well-known apparel firms was part of several discussions at Design Option Committee⁵² meetings in the late 1970s. Interested in new trends and technology in the apparel industry,

⁵¹ The remaining 22 percent were separated in this way: 18 percent were textiles and clothing majors without a stated option, two percent were in both merchandising and design, while the last two percent were in the related science option (Textiles and Clothing Department, 1972).

⁵² The Design Option Committee worked to establish guidelines and competencies to allow students to achieve a career in the apparel design field.

faculty also made connections with businesses in Iowa and in other states.⁵³ It may well have been the professors in the Textiles and Clothing Department that fueled students' desire to focus more on business and industry. As faculty took students on field trips to see different facets of the industry, they encouraged them to pursue internships and jobs in the various aspects of industry that they visited. "The fact that more students have sought and found positions in the cities visited" (ISU, 1981, p. 4) evidenced how effective the liaisons between industry and the education programs were at Iowa State.

Interviews supported the idea that interest in internships or field experience gradually increased over time. Both Interviewees A and C mentioned that when they first began teaching in the Textiles and Clothing Department, internships were an option for students; however, they were not strongly emphasized⁵⁴ (November 8, 2000; November 29, 2000). As time passed, internships took on a greater role for students in obtaining a job after graduation. Interviewee A stated that internships gained further importance "as a way of getting job experience because job experience is so limited in Iowa" (Interview A, November 8, 2000). Many students were not exposed to the apparel industry because it was so limited in Iowa, so opportunities to observe the apparel industry in many different kinds of settings was essential to students' learning.

Although internships were not a formal course in the textiles and clothing curriculum

⁵³ More internships in design and the need for more design emphasis in study tours were discussed in the Textiles and Clothing Design Option Committee meetings on January 26, 1977, September 26, 1977, October 10, 1977 and January 9, 1978. During these meetings, members drafted a letter seeking for possible field experience opportunities. This letter was mailed to a list of firms in the St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis and Chicago areas. They also contacted former graduates, working in the design field, soliciting suggestions for field experiences.

⁵⁴ Interviewee A began teaching at Iowa State University part-time in 1969 and retired in 1998. Interviewee C began teaching in 1956, retiring in 1993.

until the 1970s, the curriculum incorporated study tours in the late 1950s. Study tours gave students a brief look into different industries and businesses and the opportunity to incorporate industry knowledge into their studies. These study tours allowed students to see first-hand the daily operations and machinery involved in the apparel industry.

In the 1959-1961 Iowa State University College Catalogue, the Textiles and Clothing Department added a Senior Study Tour as a requirement for graduation. The course included tours of mills, factories, dress houses, stores, museums, and laboratories. Faculty members designed these tours to reflect the needs and aspirations of students of senior standing. The study tours involved trips to apparel manufacturers in Chicago, New York, Dallas, and California. Later, study tours abroad to Paris, Italy, and South America were added. TC 501: International Study Tours, first introduced in 1969, provided students with the opportunity to see mills, factories, laboratories, and museums in other parts of the world (Eppright & Fergusen, 1971). "These tours allow upper level students as well as the faculty members who supervise the tours to observe professionals at work in many areas of the textiles and apparel world" (ISU, 1983, p. 2).

Interviews affirmed the importance of study tours as a way to increase students' interest in work in the apparel industry, and to open students' eyes to the numerous, varied types of careers available upon graduation. Interviewee A mentioned another important aspect of study tours: the interaction with the employees in the company being toured and with alumni in the area. This interaction provided students important opportunities for future internships or jobs (Interview A, November 8, 2000).

The very emergence and subsequent emphasis placed on internships and study tours, highlights the metamorphosis of home economics and textiles and clothing from programs

designed to meet the needs of families to programs that prepared students for professional positions. Internships in the apparel design program at Iowa State, although slow to emerge, were an important factor in providing students with job related experience that potentially led to a career in the apparel industry. Study tours provided exposure to the apparel industry and to the endless career possibilities available for graduates. The combination of both internships and study tours in the 1970s and 1980s added much to the professional focus, ultimately providing students with more tools to explore and pursue careers in the apparel industry.

CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY

Higher education for women, the world of work for women, and home economics changed drastically over the course of many years. Textiles and clothing, a primary component of home economics from its inception, also changed focus. The most significant transformations occurred between 1940 and 1980 and partially reflect the changes that took place in women's higher education, wage work, and home economics. This paper examined the transitions in Iowa State University's Textiles and Clothing Department and specifically the Apparel Design program from a concentration on clothing for the home and family to career preparation for the apparel industry.

Apparel design education expanded and matured over the course of the period studied. Although this began in the early years of the twentieth century with vocational education geared toward both dressmaking and industry careers, training for careers in the apparel industry in home economics programs developed much more slowly. Home economists at Iowa State struggled with dual purposes in women's education because of the family oriented mission, which affected course content and course focus. Early vocational education, with its main emphasis on career training, was much better suited for those women who wanted to pursue a career in the apparel industry. The Apparel Design program at Iowa State, while growing tremendously from 1940-1980, was slow to develop a focus on professional preparation. Although this evolution was not complete by 1980, change and growth became evident in the 40 years examined in this paper.

The world wars created an opening for American designers in the apparel industry, which not only increased the number of jobs for designers, but also created an influx of students who enrolled and graduated from home economics programs. While the textiles and

clothing program at Iowa State added a new course in making new garments from old, allowing students to participate in the war effort, its focus remained on designing clothing for individuals and families. Possible career opportunities in textiles and clothing at Iowa State included merchandising “and other commercial positions,” but there wasn’t any mention of a career in design.

The dual purpose in education came to the forefront in the 1950s in both home economics as a whole and also in the Apparel Design program at Iowa State. Even though women continued to join the workforce in increasing numbers, home economics education at Iowa State reflected the perception that a woman’s long term “career” was centered on the home and family, and as a result, provided courses that focused on homemaking. These courses that focused on homemaking meshed with the home economics teaching component of the Textiles and Clothing Department. Some of the textiles and clothing graduates at this time became home economics teachers. The family-centered courses provided graduates the background needed to teach their students home life skills at the high school level.

It wasn’t until the late 1950s that the Textiles and Clothing Department added courses that gave students an orientation to professional careers in the apparel industry. The addition of a study tour course and a course to study professional careers in textiles and clothing gave students a way to see the opportunities that were open to them as graduates, even though many courses still revolved around sewing for individual, family, and household use.

As career opportunities for women with college degrees continued to expand, more educated women entered the workforce. Home economists tried to reconcile the gap between academics and professional careers by adding courses and opportunities for career development. Textiles and clothing and apparel design at Iowa State, while retaining their

dual focus, also made progress toward professionalization as design for the family and individual slowly became secondary to career preparation in the 1960s.

While home economists continued to struggle with the image and status of home economics, the 1970s were a time of professional growth for the apparel design program at ISU. Many discussions took place during the 1970s regarding the content of textiles and clothing courses, the incorporation of industry into coursework, and the goals and objectives of the apparel design program. These discussions provided the impetus for adding new courses and strengthening others, while finding new ways to incorporate industry into classroom learning. The addition of courses that analyzed apparel industry trends and studied designers in ready-to-wear and couture gave students additional insight into the industry.

Although the apparel design program included an industry orientation, some classes continued to be oriented to home sewing, which showed the retention of its focus on preparing students for both a design career and careers in family serving occupations, such as home economics education. This may be partly due to the small number of students enrolled in design classes as compared to merchandising classes, and a continued emphasis within home economics on family welfare. Because the apparel design program developed within home economics, it was inevitable that apparel design's coursework reflect the goals and objectives of home economics. Textiles and clothing programs did train some graduates for professional careers in the apparel industry, but from its conception, faculty in the textiles and clothing programs within home economics departments wanted to provide a well-rounded education that benefited women in any vocation that they chose.

Apparel design coursework and internships and study tours worked together toward the implementation of a more concentrated focus on preparing graduates for professional jobs

in the apparel industry. As careers after graduation took on more prominence in the curriculum, internship courses and courses involving the introduction to the industry and career options took on more prominence. The internship course was important in the professionalization of the apparel design program, as it allowed students to apply concepts and skills learned in class to practical job applications, and involved students in gaining on-the-job experience in the apparel industry. After graduation, many students found employment in the firms where they interned. Study tours provided students with the opportunity to view many different aspects of the apparel industry, exposed them to various types of jobs, and introduced students to alumni in the field of apparel design, giving them a contact in the industry after graduation. The international study tour course provided students with the opportunity to experience the apparel industry on a global level.

The Apparel Design program at Iowa State University evolved from offering individual courses on sewing, tailoring and dressmaking to a specific option in apparel design, which students used as a basis for jobs in the apparel industry. As the apparel design option was a part of the Textiles and Clothing Department and the Home Economics College, it not only provided students with the skills needed in the apparel industry, but it also gave them the basis for a solid future. Historically, the Textiles and Clothing Department at Iowa State University changed with the demands of the changing needs of the world around it; however, the total professionalization of the apparel design program was not fully integrated by the 1980s.

APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS PERMISSION FORM

Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects

Iowa State University

(Please type and use the attached instructions for completing this form)

IRB

OCT 10 2000
03

1. Title of Project The Professionalization of the Apparel Design Program at Iowa State University: 1940-1980
2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

<u>Ellen M. Friberg</u>	<u>10/2/00</u>	<u>Ellen M. Friberg</u>
Typed name of principal investigator	Date	Signature of principal investigator
<u>Textiles and Clothing</u>	<u>1052 LeBaron Hall</u>	
Department	Campus address	
<u>294-2136</u>		
Phone number to report results		

3. Signatures of other investigators	Date	Relationship to principal investigator
<u>Jean Hammer</u>	<u>10/2/00</u>	<u>Major Professor</u>

4. Principal investigator(s) (check all that apply)
- ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☒ Graduate student ☐ Undergraduate student

5. Project (check all that apply)
- ☐ Research ☒ Thesis or dissertation ☐ Class project ☐ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)

adults, non-students: 11 # minors under 14: _____ # minors 14 - 17: _____

ISU students: _____ other (explain): _____

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, item 7. Use an additional page if needed.)

The purpose of this research is to investigate the development of the career focus in the apparel design program at Iowa State University and to examine the causes of the changed focus from homemaking to professional development. Interviews with former faculty members in the textile and clothing department will provide useful information in determining how and why the focus changed. This valuable insight from the educators' standpoint will provide support to primary and secondary resources. Interviews will be conducted with 11 former textile and clothing faculty members. These oral histories will be tape recorded and numbered to insure confidentiality.

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent: ☒ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
☐ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)
☐ Not applicable to this project.

Last name of Principal Investigator Friberg**Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule**

The following are attached (please check):

12. ☒ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
- a) the purpose of the research
 - b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #'s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 17)
 - c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research
 - d) if applicable, the location of the research activity
 - e) how you will ensure confidentiality
 - f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later
 - g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject
13. ☒ Signed consent form (if applicable)
14. ☐ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)
15. ☒ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

First contact

Last contact

10/1/20005/1/01

Month/Day/Year

Month/Day/Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

5/1/01

Month/Day/Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer

Date

Department or Administrative Unit

M. Friberg10/4/00T&C

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

☒ Project approved☐ Project not approved☐ No action required

Name of Human Subjects in Research Committee Chair

Date

Signature of Committee Chair

Patricia M. Keith10-16-00pmKeith

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the development of the career focus in the apparel design program at Iowa State University and to examine the causes of the changed focus from homemaking to professional career development. You will be asked to provide insight into the Textile and Clothing program while you were employed at Iowa State University. This interview will be recorded, and your responses will remain confidential. No risks are anticipated, but as you feel tired or uncomfortable, you may end the interview at any time.

Background

Name

Date of Birth

What is your educational background?

When did you teach at Iowa State University? What dates were you employed at ISU?

What subjects did you teach? Did these subjects change while you were at ISU?

What professional organizations were you involved in?

General

Briefly reflect on the textiles and clothing department. What was it like when you started as compared to when you finished? What changes did you see?

Program Image

What was the image of the apparel design program? Did it fit in with home economics' image? Did being in a home economics college affect decisions about the program?

Goals of Students and Faculty

In your opinion, what was the role of the educator/teacher in Textiles and Clothing when you started teaching at ISU, what was the purpose of students' education? Did it change?

In your opinion, did ISU's program follow that of other universities or was it a leader in its various goals for the students?

How did the Textiles and Clothing mission focus address the apparel business industry? Did it change? When? Who headed that effort?

Did the career/personal goals of female students entering into the Textiles and Clothing program change from when you started at ISU and when you finished? What kind of degree were students seeking?

What kind of jobs did graduates of textiles and clothing, specifically apparel design, find after they graduated?

Training/Curricula/Coursework

What did you feel were the main responsibilities in teaching to students? Did your colleagues back up your teaching ideals? Did the department?

Do you feel that the apparel design program and/or classes offered came about because of students' needs or industry's needs?

Was the apparel design coursework geared toward jobs in the industry when you started teaching at ISU? To what degree? Was there a shift in the focus of coursework in the apparel design program?

Industry

Did the clothing industry push for more college graduates in their workforce? In a certain specialization? With any particular training? Did the amount of job experience (gained at school) affect students' employment?

In general, did the kind and level of degree needed (if any) to enter in the apparel industry, specifically in apparel design, change while you were at Iowa State?

Was occupational training implemented in the apparel design major? How? Through internships? Field trips to the industry?

When did the internships program start to flourish in the TC department and industry?

What as the purpose of TAAB (the Textile and Apparel Advisory Board)? Did it fulfill its purpose?

Changes

Did you feel that there was a shift from preparation for the home changed to preparation for gainful employment in the apparel design program occurred? When did it occur? Did it occur in other departments in home economics?

REFERENCES CITED

- American Home Economics Association. (1929, October). Reports of the Summer Meetings. Journal of Home Economics, 21 (10), 390-391.
- Anderson, K. (1981). Wartime women: Sex roles, family relations, and the status of women during World War II. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Arnold, P. & White, P. (1961). Clothes and cloth: America's apparel business. New York: Holiday House.
- Baragar, A. (1960, December). Opportunities for men in home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 52 (10), 833.
- Baron, A. & Klepp, S. E. (1984). "If I didn't have my sewing machine...": Women and sewing machine technology." In J. M. Jensen & S. Davidson (Eds.), A needle, a bobbin, a strike: Women needleworkers in America (pp. 20-59). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Baylor, S. & Wybourn, M. (1950, December). Third Clothing and Textile Seminar. Journal of Home Economics, 42 (10), 803-804.
- Beecher, C. E. (1848). A treatise on domestic economy for the young ladies at home, and at school. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Blackwelder, J. K. (1997). Now hiring: The feminization of work in the United States, 1900-1995. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Boas, L. S. (1935). Woman's education begins: The rise of women's colleges. Norton, MA: Wheaton College Press.
- Brandau, E. P., Myers, D. E., & Monroe, D. (1950, February). Second Syracuse clothing seminar. Journal of Home Economics, 42 (2), 106-107.
- Brown, M. M. (1985). Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States (Vol. I-II). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Brown, M. M. (1993). Philosophical studies in home economics: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Buckland, S. S. (1996). Promoting American fashion 1940 through 1945: From understudy to star. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Cain, G. (1950). The American way of designing. New York: Fairchild Publications, Inc.

- Carver, M. N. (1979, May). Home economics as an academic discipline: A short history. Tucson, AZ: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.
- Clifford, G. (1982). "Marry, stitch, die or do worse": Educating women for work. In H. Kantor & D.B. Tyack (Eds), Work, youth and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education (pp. 223-268). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- CCI meeting. (1981, September 15). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Clothing and textiles move forward. (1956, October). Journal of Home Economics, 48 (8), 635-639.
- Coburn, G. (1899). Iowa State Agricultural College Catalogue. Ames, IA: Iowa State Agricultural College.
- Conaway, F. R. (1936, March). Mrs. Mary B. Welch. Unpublished document, Iowa State College.
- Craig, H. T., & Stover, B. M. (Eds.). (n.d.). The history of home economics. New York City, NY: Practical Home Economics.
- Creekmore, A. M. (1968, February). The concept basic to home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 60 (2), 93-99.
- Deacon, R. (1978, February). The Dean's letter to the alumni of the College of Home Economics. Unpublished letter, Iowa State University.
- Design committee minutes. (1977, October 10). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Design group minutes. (1977, November 7). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Design/selection subject matter group meeting. (1981, October 22). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Dickey, L. E. (1990). History of the Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing – Central Region, 1944-1988: ACPTC Special Publication #1. Monument, CO: Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing, Inc.
- Dohr, J., & Forbess, L. (1984). Art and design: Impact in home economics and on families. In American Home Economics Association (Ed.), Definitive themes in home economics and their impact on families 1909-1984. (pp.103-118). Washington, D.C: American Home Economics Association.

- Donahue, M. (2000). Educating women for the feminine apparel industry: Fashion design, dressmaking, and domesticity, New York 1894-1950. Knowledge and Society, 12, 107-128.
- East, M. (1980). Home economics: Past, present, and future. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Eppright, E.S., & Fergusen, E. S. (1971). A century of home economics at Iowa State University. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Epstein, M. M. (1958, April). A career in fashion design. Journal of Home Economics, 50 (4), 261-3.
- Evenson, P. & Patwell, J. (Eds.). (1994). American Heritage Dictionary. (3rd ed.). New York: Dell Publishing.
- Farrell-Beck, J. (1985). Unpublished document, Iowa State University.
- Field experience Programs, College of Home Economics. (1977, November). Unpublished document, Iowa State University.
- Frey, C. H. (1990). Comparison study of textile and clothing programs in schools of home economics in land-grant institutions and textile schools: Consumer and family versus business and industry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Friedan, B. (1963). The feminine mystique. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Gates, M. J. (1976). Occupational segregation and the law. In M. Blaxall & B. Reagan (Eds.), Women and the workplace (pp. 61-74). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goals and Objectives. (1975, March). Unpublished document, Iowa State University.
- Goldin, C. D. (1990). Understanding the gender gap: An economic history of American women. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Goodsell, W. (Ed.). (1931). Pioneers of women's education in the United States. New York: AMS Press.
- Gove, P. B. (Ed.). (1981). Websters third new international dictionary of the English language. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- Griffiths, M. W. (1976). Can we still afford occupational segregation? In M. Blaxall & B. Reagan (Eds.), Women and the workplace. (pp. 7-13). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Hall, O. A. (1958). Home economics careers and homemaking. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hall, R. & Hollen, N. (1961, November). New college approach to clothing construction. Journal of Home Economics, 53 (9), 774-775.
- Harman, H. (1943, February). Can trade and college meet in the field of clothing design? Journal of Home Economics, 35 (2), 77-79.
- Hattersley, N. (1910). The field of domestic arts. In A. F. Perkins (Ed.), Vocations for the trained woman: Opportunities other than teachers (pp. 100-107). New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Hawthorne, B. (1984). The heritage. In American Home Economics Association. (Ed.), Definitive Themes in Home Economics and Their Impact on Families: 1909-1984 (pp. 1-12). Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.
- Heisey, F. (1984, Fall). The future of apparel production and construction. Journal of Home Economics, 76 (3), 8-12.
- Hesse-Barber, S. J. & Carter, G. L. (2000). Working women in America: Split dreams. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hilton, H. L. (1975, January 6). Beyond the women's movement. Unpublished address, Iowa State University.
- Hoeflin, R. (1970). Careers in home economics. London: Collier Macmillan Limited.
- Hoeflin, R., Pence, K., Miller, M. G., & Weber, J. (1981). Careers for professionals: New perspectives in home economics. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Hooks, J. M. (1978). Women's occupations through seven decades. Washington, DC: Zenger Publishing.
- Horn, M. J. (1963, April). Curriculum change? How widespread? Journal of Home Economics, 44 (4), 237-240.
- Horn, M. J. (1986, October). Implications for clothing and textiles. In R. H. Marshall (Ed.), Proceedings from the National Meeting of College Teachers in Textiles and Clothing (pp. 11-16). Monument, CO: Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing.
- Humphreyville, T. R. (1963). Futures for home economists. Inglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hunt, C. L. (1912). The life of Ellen H. Richards. Boston: Whitcomb & Barrows.

International Textile and Apparel Association. (n.d.). ITAA history. Retrieved June 25, 2004, from International Textile and Apparel Association Web site:
<http://www.itaonline.org/template.asp?intPageId=10>

Iowa State Agricultural College. (n.d.). Annual report: Department of domestic economy 1901-1902. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1902). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1912). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1916-17). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1924). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1926). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1929). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1931). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1932). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1937). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1940). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1943). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

Iowa State College. (1953). Iowa State Agricultural College catalogue. Ames: Iowa State Agricultural College.

- Iowa State College & Department of Home Economics (Producers). (1951). Story of home economics [Film]. (Available from Iowa State University Library Archives, Ames, IA).
- Iowa State University. (1959). Iowa State University College catalogue: 1959-61. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1961). Iowa State University general catalogue: 1961-63. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1963). Iowa State University general catalogue: 1963-65. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1965). Iowa State University of Science and Technology general catalogue: 1965-67. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1969). Iowa State University general catalogue: 1969-71. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1971). Iowa State University general catalogue: 1971-73. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1973). Iowa State University bulletin general catalogue: 1973-75. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1975). Iowa State University bulletin general catalogue: 1977-79. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1981). Iowa State University bulletin general catalogue: 1981-83. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1978, May). Annual report. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1983). Textiles and clothing, annual report: Century update. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Iowa State University. (1986, Fall). Apparel design and patternmaking. Planning for a career through study at Iowa State University (n.p.)
- Kennedy, D. M. (1999). Freedom from fear: The American people in depression and war, 1929-1945. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kessler-Harris, A. (1981). Women have always worked. Old Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press.

- Kessler-Harris, A. (1982). Out to work: A history of wage-earning women in the United States. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kievet, M. B. (1968, November). Women in gainful and useful employment. Journal of Home Economics, 60 (9). 697-702.
- Kwolek-Folland, A. (1998). Incorporating women: A history of women and business in the United States. New York, NY: Twayne Publishers.
- LeBaron, H. R. (1957, October). Data on special programs of education for women in the four-year college. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Council on Education on the Session on "Education" of the Conference on the Present Status and Prospective Trends of Research on the Education of Women, Rye, NY.
- LeBaron, H. R. (1961, February). The College of Home Economics. The Alumnus. 6-9.
- LeBaron, H. R. (1964, June). Goals of textiles and clothing in higher education. In D. Myers (Ed.), Proceedings from the National Meeting of College Teachers in Textiles and Clothing (pp. 7-20). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- LeBaron, H. R. (1967, March). Education of women for today's world. Unpublished address, Iowa State University.
- Lyle, M. S. (1955). Alumnae study, part I: Division of home economics. Unpublished document, Iowa State College.
- Lyle, M.S. (1957, January). Graduates reflect on their education. Journal of Home Economics, 49 (1), 9-12.
- MacDonald, E., & MacDonald, F. (1927). Homemaking: A profession for men and women. Boston: Marshall Jones Company.
- Manis, H. (1980, Spring). Internships: A quick way to gain professional experience. Journal of Home Economics, 72 (1), 5-6.
- Margolis, M. L. (2000). True to her nature. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Marshall, R. H. (1978, March). New clothing course. Journal of Home Economics, 70 (4), 8-9.
- Matthaei, J. A. (1982). An economic history of women in America: Women's work, the sexual division of labor, and the development of capitalism. New York: Schocken Books.

- McGowan, F. (1920). Arts and crafts: Designing, a vocation for college women. In C. Filene (Ed.). Careers for women (pp. 57-60). New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- McGrath, E. J. (1968, February). The changing mission of home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 60 (2), 85-93.
- McGrath, E. J. (1968, September). The imperatives of change for home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 60 (9), 505-8.
- McGrath, E. J. & Johnson, J. T. (1968). The changing mission of home economics: A report on home economics in the land-grant colleges and state universities. Columbia University: Teacher's College Press.
- McMullen, J. (1926, June). Pioneering in home economics. The Iowa Homemaker, 6 (2), 8-13.
- Milbank, C. R. (1989). New York: The evolution of American style. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Mintz, S. (1995). Moralists and modernizers. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Minutes of CCI meeting. (1976, September). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Minutes of design option committee. (1977, Jan. 26). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.
- Moen, P. (1992). Women's two roles: A contemporary dilemma. New York: Auburn House.
- Myers, D. & Brandau, E. (1949, November). A fashion pilgrimage. Journal of Home Economics, 41 (9), 519.
- News notes. (1941, April). Journal of Home Economics, 33 (4), 287.
- News notes. (1941, June). Journal of Home Economics, 33 (5), 442.
- News notes. (1942, December). Journal of Home Economics, 34 (10), 766.
- News notes. (1943, May). Journal of Home Economics, 35 (5), 324.
- News notes. (1945, April). Journal of Home Economics, 37 (4), 252.
- News notes. (1946, March). Journal of Home Economics, 38 (3), 189.

- News notes. (1946, November). Journal of Home Economics, 38 (9), 618.
- News notes. (1947, October). Journal of Home Economics, 39 (8), 542.
- News notes. (1950, November). Journal of Home Economics, 42 (9), 762, 765-766.
- News notes. (1956, February). Journal of Home Economics, 48 (2), 144.
- Nystrom, P. H. (1941, March). Home economics and consumer education. Journal of Home Economics, 33 (3), 145-147.
- Ogden, A. S. (1986). The great American housewife: From helpmate to wage earner, 1776-1986. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Oglesby, C. (1935). Fashion careers American style. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
- Parsons, J. L. (1998). Dressmakers: Transitions in the urban production of custom-made clothing, 1880-1920. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Parsons, J. L. (2004). "For homemaking and a trade": Paradox and problems in the early development of systemized sewing instruction. Unpublished manuscript.
- Peters, C. (1973). Employment of home economist in textiles and clothing related positions not associated with educational institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.
- Phillips, V. (1957). Home economics careers for you. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Picken, M. B. (1941, October). American dress design for American women by American women. Journal of Home Economics, 33 (8), 544-9.
- Powers, J. B. (1992). The girl question in education. London: Falmer Press.
- Reskin, B. F. & Hartmann, H. I. (Eds.). (1986). Women's work, men's work: Sex segregation on the job. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Richards, E. H. (1904). The art of right living. Boston: Whitcomb & Barrows.
- Richards, F. S. (1951). The ready-to-wear industry. New York: Fairchild.
- Ripley, G. W. (1910, October). Teaching design to trade classes. Journal of Home Economics, 2 (4), 366-368.
- Ritchie, D. A. (1995). Doing oral history. New York: Twayne Publishers.

- Roberts, R. W. (1965). Vocational and practical arts education: History, development and principles (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Rose, F. (1969). Part I. A page of modern education, 1900-1940: Forty years of home economics at Cornell University. In Cornell University (Ed.), A growing college: Home economics at Cornell University (pp. 109-519). Ithaca, NY: Harry Hoffman & Sons.
- Rossiter, M. W. (1997). The men move in: Home economics, 1950-1970. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession. (pp. 96-117). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sartoris, M. (1948, February). Training of a young designer. Journal of Home Economics, 40 (2), 84.
- Scott, A. F. (Ed.). (1971). The American woman: Who was she? Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Semeniuk, A. O. & Galbraith, L. K. (1964, June). Pretesting freshman women students to determine clothing background. Journal of Home Economics, 56 (6), 403-406.
- Shapiro, D., Shaw, L. B. (1982). Labor force attachment of married women age 30 to 34: An intercohort comparison. In F. L. Mott (Ed.), The employment revolution: Young American women in the 1970s. (pp. 102-119). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sicherman, B. (1988). College and careers: Historical perspectives on the lives and work patterns of women college graduates. In J. M. Faragher & F. Howe (Eds.), Women and higher education in American history (pp. 130-164). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Sisler, G. (1977, November). Clothing construction course. Journal of Home Economics, 69 (5), 49.
- Sklar, K. K. (1976). Catharine Beecher: A study in American domesticity. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sloop, F. (1947, September). When school and store cooperate. In Journal of Home Economics, 39 (7), 411.
- Spafford, I. (Ed.). (1949). Home economics in higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.
- Stage, S. (1997). Introduction home economics: What's in a name? In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession (pp. 1-14). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Stocks, E. H. (1969). Part II. A second page, 1940-1965. In Cornell University (Ed.). A growing college: Home economics at Cornell University (pp. 109-519). Ithaca, NY: Harry Hoffman & Sons.

Tate, M. T. (1961). Home economics as a profession. New York: McGraw Hill.

TC curriculum committee minutes. (1984, April 12). Unpublished minutes, Iowa State University.

Technical opportunities in home economics. (1912, October). Journal of Home Economics, 4 (4), 390-391.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1958, May 14). The objectives of the Textiles and Clothing Department. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1972, May 17). Program review, College of Home Economics, Textiles and Clothing Department. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1975). A self-study report: North Central accreditation report. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1977, March 11). College of Home Economics, Textiles and Clothing Department program review. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department. (1980, December). Industrial applications. Textiles and Clothing Department Newsletter, 1.

Textiles and Clothing Department. (1980, December). New space in MacKay Hall. Textiles and Clothing Department Newsletter, 1.

Textiles and Clothing Department. (1981, December). Liaison with business. Textiles and Clothing Department Newsletter, 2, 4.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1983). Century update, annual report. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1984). College program review. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

Textiles and Clothing Department (1984). Annual report. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.

- Textiles and Clothing Department (1986, December). Mission statement. Unpublished document, Iowa State University.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1975). Historical statistics of the United States, colonial times to 1970, Bicentennial edition, part 2. Washington, D.C.: Author. 140.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1950). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (71 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. 186-187.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1960). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (81 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. 220-221.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1970). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (91 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. 228-229.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1980). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (101 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. 420-421.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1981). Statistical Abstracts of the United States (102 ed.). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. 388-9.
- United States Department of Labor. (1994). 1993 Handbook on women workers: Trends and issues. Washington, D.C.: Author. 19.
- United States Department of Labor. (n.d.) Title IX, Education Amendment of 1972. Retrieved March 16, 2004, from United States Department of Labor Web site: <http://www.dol.gov/oasam/regs/statutes/titleix.htm>
- United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1971). College women seven years after graduation. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. (pp. 467-493). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing.
- Van Syckle, C., Myers, D., & Topp, H. (1948, April). Integrating clothing and design courses. Journal of Home Economics, 40 (4), 189-190.
- Wait, J. L. (1977, November). Home economists in business: National survey of textiles and clothing jobs. Journal of Home Economics, 69 (5), 44-45.
- Wallace, M. D. (1959, January). Integrated clothing courses for prospective teachers. Journal of Home Economics, 51 (1), 25-27.
- Walls, N. de A. (1994, Fall). Educating women for art and commerce: The Philadelphia School of Design, 1848-1932. History of Education Quarterly, 34 (3), 329-355.

- Watkins, S. M. (1974, November). New careers for home economists: Designing functional clothing. Journal of Home Economics, 66 (7), 33-38.
- Wein, R. (1993). "Women's colleges and domesticity, 1875-1918." In N. F. Mott (Ed.). History of women in the United States: Historical articles on women's lives and activities (Vol. 12, pp. 334-350). Munich, Germany: K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH & Co. KG.
- Weis, S., East, M., & Manning, S. (1974, May). Home economics units in higher education: A decade of change. Journal of Home Economics, 66 (5), 11-15.
- Welch, M. B. (1876). Lecture. Unpublished document.
- Whitesel, R. (1956, May). A realistic approach to the teaching of clothing. Journal of Home Economics, 48 (5), 360.
- Whitlock, M. C. (1959, June). National meeting of three regions of college and clothing teachers. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Whitlock, M. C. & Morgan, M. I. (1952, April). Implications for clothing and textiles in family centered college programs. Journal of Home Economics, 44 (4), 269-271.
- Wilson, P. (Ed.). (1992, July). Salaried and professional women: Relevant statistics publication #92-3. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
- Woman's work in applied design. (1905, April 12). The New York Times, n.p.
- Woody, T. (1929). A history of women's education in the United States (Vol. 2). New York & Lansing, PA: The science press.
- Wright, E. (1949, April). Clothing and textile internships in Texas. Journal of Home Economics, 41 (4), 190-192.
- Wybourn, M. (1952, October). Family centered clothing course. Journal of Home Economics, 44 (8), 627-628.